Nancy Hanks Lincoln Public Library

The text of this book remains unchanged from the original published version. It should be noted that some comments or words in this edition might be culturally insensitive to certain readers. Views and words of the author or authors are theirs alone and not of the Nancy Hanks Lincoln Public Library. Certain words or slang used in the past had different cultural meanings at the time and might not mean the same thing today.

Publishing and spelling errors remain unchanged from the original versions. All text images were reproduced exactly without changes to the existing material.

THE LAST OF THE "MAYFLOWER"

PUBLISHED FOR THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY AT
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS (H. M. McKECHNIE, Secretary)
12 LIME GROVE, OXFORD ROAD, MANCHESTER
LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON: 39 PATERNOSTER ROW
NEW YORK: 443-449 FOURTH AVENUE AND THIRTIETH STREET
BOMBAY: 8 HORNBY ROAD
CALCUTTA: 6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET
MADRAS: 167 MOUNT ROAD

#15057

THE LAST OF THE "MAYFLOWER"

BY

RENDEL HARRIS

MANCHESTER: AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONGMANS, GREEN & COMPANY

LONDON, NEW YORK, CHICAGO, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, MADRAS

1920

DE FRAGMENTO ARGUS.

Fragmentum, quod vile putas et inutile lignum,
Haec fuit ignoti prima carina maris.
Quam nec Cyaneae quondam potuere ruinae
Frangere, nec Scythici tristior ira freti.
Saecula vicerunt: sed quamvis cesserit annis,
Sanctior est salva parva tabella rate.

MARTIAL, *Epigr.* vii. 19.

"It would afford high gratification to announce that any additional information had been received respecting the ship "Mayflower," subsequent to the voyages already known to our history; but the most thorough investigation of Mr. Hunter, and other gentlemen in England, has thus far failed to accomplish satisfactory results; and, though numerous vessels called by her favourite name are found enrolled on the appropriate records of that period, none can be fairly identified as the one so memorable in our annals, which first bore the intrepid, triumphant founders of an empire to the shores of America and the home of freedom."

Russell, *Pilgrim Memorials*, p. 50.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGES
I.	The Migration of the Leyden Pilgrims . .	1-9
II.	Three Letters of John Eliot and a Bill of Lading of the "Mayflower" . . .	9-22
III.	The "Mayflower" in the East Indies . .	22-44
IV.	The "Mayflower" as Whaler	44-70
V.	Mr. Marsden's Theory of the two Pilgrim "Mayflowers"	70-95
VI.	Mr. Webber's "Mayflower"	95-100
VII.	Mr. Vassall's "Mayflower"	100-104
APPENDIX		
I.	Another Letter from John Eliot . . .	105-110
II.	Further Hanmer Letters	111-122
	Additional Note for Page 81	122

THE LAST OF THE "MAYFLOWER".

CHAPTER I.

The Migration of the Leyden Pilgrims.

It is not uncommon for those who write of the Pilgrims who left Old England for New England in 1620, and who have in view the marvellous human issues which resulted from that great adventure on the part of a handful of religious enthusiasts, to make a pictorial parallel between the little ship in which they sailed and the famous Greek ship "Argo," in which Jason and his companions went to Colchis to fetch the Golden Fleece.

Just as the Greeks felt that Jason, though spoken of at times contemptuously as a mere merchant (*Jason mercator*), was in reality under divine leading, and that even the timbers of the "Argo" were sacred, blended, as they said, with beams from the Holy Oak at Dodona, while her keel was laid under the direct supervision of the great goddess Athena, so there has been gathering round the story of the "Mayflower" an air of romance and of religion, which in an earlier day would have expressed itself in the terms of mythological fancy; for it is difficult to resist the conclusion that some good spirit was walking the earth at the time when the "Mayflower" was a-making, and when her company was gathering from out-of-the-way corners of England to try conclusions with Destiny and to vindicate Divine Providence.

I do not remember precisely the steps by which the good ship "Argo" underwent canonisation and obtained

a place amongst the stars: but it must have been at an early date, since the Greek astronomers, such as Eratosthenes and Aratus know of her place amongst the constellations, and it is, therefore, no modern fancy that has sketched her form upon the celestial globe. The "Mayflower" is also undergoing a process of canonisation. Just as the Greeks rounded off the history of the "Argo" with various tales of earth and heaven, placing the complete ship in the temple of Poseidon on the Isthmus of Corinth, and preserving fragments which were believed to belong to her woodwork far into historical times,[1] and finally idealising her form in the firmament, so the modern student searches into the traces of the "Argo" of the Atlantic, and treasures up every reminiscence of her that history can suggest.

In the present volume I am to try and answer the question, What became of the "Mayflower"? Her homeward voyage in the spring of 1621 turned the Pilgrims finally into exiles: did she ever make the Atlantic voyage again, or any other voyage? Does anyone know? Can anyone tell? Had she a long life as ships go, or a short life? Was she finally wrecked, or burnt, or broken up? Was she lugged to her last berth, like the "Fighting Téméraire in Turner's picture, and does she now lie buried deep in the ooze?

In making the inquiry which is to answer some of these questions, we have to lay down a preliminary caution. For some obscure reason the name of "Mayflower" was a common one for ships in the late Tudor and early Stuart periods.[2] Quite a number of "Mayflowers" have been recognised and registered by curious inquirers. Here is an illustration which will show at a

[1] See Martial, 7, 19, *De Fragmento Argus*.

[2] See, for example, the list of sixteenth-century "Mayflowers" in Hunter, *Founders of New Plymouth*, p. 193.

glance the tendency to which we refer, of naming the ship after the flower.

In the year 1621 one Richard Swan took a voyage in a ship named the "Hart" to the coast of Arabia; his account of his voyage is preserved in the *Marine Records* of the East India Company. He tells us that he joined a fleet which set sail from Swally, the port of Surat in the Punjab, on 6 April. Their destination was the Persian Gulf. On the 1st of May they captured a Portuguese ship of 200 tons, called the "S. Antonio," laden with rice and bound from Goa to Muskat and Ormus. Having taken possession of their prize they promptly rechristened her. She was now no longer the "S. Antonio" but the "Mayflower," so named from the date of her capture. She turned out to be a very poor sailor and a great hindrance to the rest of the fleet, on account of her making excessive leeway; moreover, she proved to be leaky. On 17 May Swan notes that they had missed Socotra owing to the bad sailing of the "Mayflower" ("that leeward cart"), and that they had sailed northward to the Arabian Coast.[1] Here they had another brush with the Portuguese; for we find in a letter of Richard Jefferies, writing from Chaul Road to the Company on 5 October, 1621, that "the 'London,' 'Andrews,' 'Mayflower,' and 'Primrose' went within Cape Rosalgate (Ras-al-hadd), and the seventh June anchored at Tewee, where wee had all sorts of refreshments, until certayne Portingalls (sent from Mascatte) forbid and defended the watering-place; but wee toke yt without asking leave, and thereof had our pleasures, and for their dishonestie we burned the towne and spoyled many their date-trees."[2]

[1] See *English Factories in India*, 1618-1621, p. 284, from *Marine Records of the East India Company*, vol. xxx.

[2] *English Factories in India*, p. 288, from *Original Correspondence* (*O.C.*), No. 998.

The story has a buccaneering touch about it, consonant with the traditions of the British shipmen of the day.

The fleet reached the Persian Gulf in safety, and anchored, probably at Gombroon, where they sold the prize rice, and then broke up the "Mayflower" for firewood.[1]

So much for our fictitious, pseudonymous, contemporary "Mayflower". While she was being transferred from the care of the Portingalls to that of the buccaneering British, the true "Mayflower" was working her way back across the Atlantic to her original moorings in the Thames. Nine (or ten) years later we find her engaged on a precisely similar service, that of transporting the remainder of the Leyden Colony to New Plymouth. By this time the original settlers had shaken themselves free from the financial embarrassments in which they had been entangled by the merchant adventurers who assisted them on their first migration; and as Miss Cockshott points out[2] "the first use the Pilgrims made of their freedom was to send for the remainder of their friends from Leyden, and in 1629 and 1630, at great expense, they managed to get them transported to the Colony in the 'Talbot' and the 'Mayflower'". It is generally assumed that this is the original ship "Mayflower" chartered a second time for a similar voyage to that which she made in 1620. This time she did not voyage alone, but apparently in convoy with a squadron

[1] So we gather from Archibald Jennison's account of his voyage to Arabia: who notes under 28 June, 1621, "letters received from the 'Hart' and the 'Roebuck' which were answered next day. During the next few weeks the greater part of the rice was disposed of, and the 'Mayflower,' which was in a leaky condition, was thereupon broken up for firewood." See *Eng. Fact.*, p. 286, from *Marine Records*, xxxii.

[2] Cockshott, *Hist. of Pilgrim Fathers*, p. 227.

bound for the rising Puritan Colony at Salem. Prince's account of the reception of this last group of Pilgrims is as follows :—

"August 1629. Thirty-five of our friends with their families, arrived at Plymouth. They shipped at London in May, with the ships that came to Salem, which brings over many pious persons to begin the Churches there. So that their being long kept back is now accomplished by Heaven with a double blessing. . . . The charge is reckoned on the several families, some fifty pounds, some forty, some thirty, as their number and expenses were, which our undertakers pay for gratis, besides giving them houses, preparing them grounds to plant on, and maintain them with corn, etc., above thirteen or fourteen months, before they have a harvest of their own production."

This account is digested from Bradford's *Journal*, who notes as follows under the date 1629 :—[1]

"Mr. Allerton safely arriving in England and delivering his letters, and their freinds there, and acquainting them with his Instructions ; found good acceptation with them, and they were very forward and willing to joyne with them in ye partnership of trade, and in ye charge to send ouer ye Leyden people ; a company whereof were already come out of Holand, and prepared to come over, and so were sent away before Mr. Allerton could be ready to come. They had passage with ye ships that came to Salem, that brought over many godly persons to begin the plantations, and churches of Christ there, and in ye Bay of Massachusetts ; so their long stay and keeping back was recompensed by ye Lord, to thr freinds here with a duble blessing, in that they not only enjoyed them now beyond ther late expectations (when all their hops seemed to be cut off), but with them

[1] *Journal* (facsimile), p. 163.

many more godly freinds and Christian brethren, as ye beginning of a larger harvest unto ye Lord: in ye increase of his churches and people in those parts, to ye admiration of many, and allmost wonder of ye world; that of so small beginnings so great things should Insue; as time after manifested, and that there should be a resting place for so many of ye Lord's people, when so sharp a scourge came upon their own nation; but it was ye Lord's doing and it ought to be marvellous in our eyes."

The sentence about the "small beginnings" that become "the wonder of the world," remind us of the noble lines of Lowell:—

> O small beginnings, ye are great and strong,
> Based on a faithful heart and weariless brain!
> Ye build the future fair, ye conquer wrong,
> Ye earn the crown and wear it not in vain.

From a letter of James Sherley to Governor Bradford, which is inserted at this point in the *Journal*, we gather that there had been some opposition to the introduction of such a large body of recruits into the Colony, to enter into and appropriate other men's labours, and to lay fresh financial burdens upon the settlers. However, as the following from Sherley's missive shows, the colonists had been true to their original ideals, and loyal to the friends whom they had left behind them. Sherley's letter is dated 25 March, 1629, and it runs as follows:—

"Sr &c: here are now many of your's and our freinds from Leyden, coming ouer who though for ye most part be but a weak company, yet herein is a good parte of that end ordained, which was aimed at, and which hath been so strongly opposed, by some of our former adventurers. But God hath His working in these things, which man cannot frustrate. With them we

have also sent some seruants in y^e^ ship caled the 'Talbut' that went hence lately; but these come in y^e^ 'Mayflower'. . . .

"Your unfained and ever loving freind,

"James Sherley."

According to Captain John Smith, writing in 1629, the fleet of the Massachusetts Company of that year was composed of six vessels, amongst which we note the "Talbot" and the "Mayflower":—

"Now this year 1629, a great company of people of good ranke, zeale, meanes, and quality, have made a great stocke, and with six good ships in the months of April and May (1629) they set saile from *Thames* for the Bay of the *Massachusetts*, otherwise called *Charles* River; viz. the 'George Bonaventure' of twenty pieces of ordnance, the 'Talbot' nineteen, the 'Lion's Whelpe' eight, the 'Mayflower' fourteene, the 'Foure Sisters' fourteene, the 'Pilgrim' foure: with three hundred and fifty men, women and children, etc., etc."[1]

From a postscript to the Massachusetts Company's first letter to Endicott we find that of these ships the "George Bonaventure" was still riding in the Hope (at Tilbury) on 21 April, and the "Talbot" and "Lion's Whelpe" were still at Blackwall. The "George Bonaventure" (Captain Cox) left the Isle of Wight on 4 May, and the "Talbot" (Captain Beecher) and the "Lion's Whelpe" (Captain John Gibbs) on 11 May.

On 28 May the Company write: "We now send these three ships, viz. the 'Mayflower' of Yarmouth

[1] *The True Travels and Observations of Captain I. Smith, from Anno Domini* 1593 *to* 1629, p. 48. The title of this book bears the date 1630, and it was entered for publication at Stationers' Hall on 29 August, 1629.

(William Peirse, Master), the 'Foure Sisters' of London (Roper Harman, Master), the 'Pilgrim' of London (William Wobridge, Master)," and they recommend that in case of fishing on the Banks of Newfoundland the emigrants do "confer and advise with Mr. Peirse, who had formerly fished there".

These extracts explain what Sherley means by saying that the "Talbot" sailed before the "Mayflower". The "Talbot" carried Higginson amongst her spiritual freight; her natural burden was 300 tons. The "Mayflower" was evidently a much smaller ship.

Next year seventeen ships sailed for the New England plantations: amongst them the "Mayflower," no longer carrying Leyden Pilgrims, who appear to be all across the water in a previous year, and a small ship called the "Handmaid," apparently from Old Plymouth, with a contingent of settlers for New Plymouth.

Prince makes out a table of sailings for these seventeen ships as follows :—

No.	*Name.*	*Whence?*	*Depart.*	*Arrive.*	*Whither?*
1.	Lion	Bristol	February	May	Salem
2.	Mary & John	Plymouth	20 March	30 May	Nantasket
3.	Arbella	Yarmouth (I. of Wight)	8 April	12 June	Salem
4.	Jewel			13 June	
5.	Ambrose			18 June	
6.	Talbot			2 July	
7.	Mayflower	Southampton	May	1 July	Charlestown
8.	Whale				
9.	Hopewell	Southampton	May	11 July?	Salem
10.	William & Francis			3 July	
11.	Trial	Southampton	May	5 July	Charlestown
12.	Charles				
13.	Success	Southampton	May	6 July	[Salem]
14.	Gift		May	20 Aug.	Charlestown
15.	Another		June	—	—
16.	Handmaid		Aug.	29 Oct.	Plymouth
17.	Another private venture				

The "Mayflower" is no longer under the mastership of Captain Peirse, who has been transferred to the

"Lion," in which he makes many voyages to New England and the West Indies.

When the "Arbella," the flag-ship of the Company's fleet, reached her destination at two in the morning on 12 June, 1630, she descried the "Lion" (William Peirse, Master), who had arrived some days previously, and who promptly sent off a skiff to the "Arbella". Apparently Peirse does not return to residence in Yarmouth nor to Old England. He became a member of the Church at Boston, where his name stands as the last admitted to fellowship of 151 members received up to the date, 10 October, 1632.

The "Mayflower," as we shall see reason to believe, returned to Yarmouth in 1630, and went to the whale fishery—but of this more anon.

The "Mayflower" was still in the Atlantic trade ten years after the great historical voyage. This, then, is our second fixed point in the history of the "Mayflower".

The next fixed point is the discovery that a ship "Mayflower" was employed in 1653 in carrying goods to Boston for John Eliot, the apostle of the Red Indians, and his disciples. If this is the same vessel, from an apostolical ship she has now become, for the occasion at least, a mission ship, which is no great change in her calling. The discovery is so interesting that we give a whole section to the documentary evidence, as follows.

CHAPTER II.

THREE LETTERS OF JOHN ELIOT AND A BILL OF LADING OF THE "MAYFLOWER".

AMONGST a number of valuable autograph letters, formerly in the possession of Mrs. Luke, the authoress of the children's hymn, whose first line runs

I think when I read that sweet story of old,

there lay three letters of John Eliot, the Apostle of the North American Indians, addressed to the Rev. Jonathan Hanmer of Barnstaple, England, and containing some interesting details as to the work of Christianising and civilising the red man. With these letters there was a Bill of Lading of the goods supplied to John Eliot, by an English friend who took a keen interest in the work among the Indians, and communicated with John Eliot through Jonathan Hanmer. His name was Spragot. The main interest in this Bill of Lading lies in the fact that the goods were carried in the famous ship "Mayflower," which was in 1653 still trading with New England, but now under Puritan ownership and a Puritan captain, Master Thomas Webber of Boston. Thus the famous ship, which carried the idea of a religious republic westward, may have been still engaged in the North Atlantic trade thirty-three years after the Pilgrims landed on Cape Cod.

At first sight it seems as if her point of departure was Bristol; but as we read the document through, it appears that the goods were shipped from London, having been (wholly or in part) forwarded thither from Bristol. Apparently Jonathan Hanmer's market for his cloth and canvas to clothe his Red Indians was Bristol, and the goods went thence, in the first instance, by road: or, perhaps, as there is a special charge for carting to the water-side, as well as for carriage from Bristol, the goods may have gone to London by some coasting vessel and been transferred in the Thames to the "Mayflower".

The documents are thus of the first importance; they have a bearing on American History and upon the History of Missions. They have recently passed, by the agency of an American bookseller, at Boston, into the hands of a Transatlantic collector: while we should

have been glad to retain them in England, for an ornament to the proposed Mayflower University at Plymouth, their right place is clearly on the other side of the water. As to the source from which Mrs. Luke derived these documents, it is clear, from the fact that there are one or two other letters of Jonathan Hanmer in her collection, that they must be derived ultimately from Barnstaple and the Hanmer family. Jonathan Hanmer was a great Puritan leader and preacher in Barnstaple up to the time of the ejectment in 1662, when he becomes the first Nonconformist minister of that town, to whom the Barnstaple Dissenters refer their parentage. It was known from other sources that there was a strong missionary element in the Puritan churches of the seventeenth century. Their associations for work of a religious character developed collaterally into the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. It is interesting to find the name of John Eliot connected in some degree with the very un-Puritanical S.P.G. Shall we call it a case of Apostolical Succession? The churches of Puritan sympathy and tendency in the West of England appear to have been keenly interested in John Eliot's apostolical labours: contributions came in, not only from private persons like Mr. Spragot, but from communities like the church at Exeter of which Mr. Nichols was minister.

John Eliot designed to make his converts graduate in "civility" before admitting them to Church Fellowship, and so his mission involved town-planning, and the organisation of town-life. The centre of this town-life was the meeting-house, upon which the Indians were already engaged when Eliot wrote.

It is interesting to note that the Puritan zeal for learning was in evidence on both sides of the water. John Eliot begged books and bought books, both for

himself and for a colleague of his named Mahew, and the Devonshire churches (Exeter in particular) were able to contribute the latest biblical literature. We notice that Eliot expected his goods to come either from Barnstaple or Bristol, and does not ask that they should be sent by the "Mayflower," but by any trading vessel carrying goods to Massachusetts Bay or to the Banks of Newfoundland. There is said to be a fourth letter in the collection, which relates to the ordination of John Eliot's son to the ministry. Of this I have no copy; those which are here transcribed for me have occasional lacunæ, where a word could not be read. As I have not had access to the documents, and have not yet succeeded in getting a photograph of them, the blanks must be filled up by conjecture.

Letter I, Dated 19t of the 5t/52 (1652).

Reverend and deare Sr

I have receivd your letr dated March. 12.-51. wherein the Lord hath made you an unexpected instrument and messenger of incouragmt, and supply unto this work of the Lord among these poore Indians, and that it may be when expected help may be more slow: that so the Lord might please to show himself the only guide and . . . for his people in all their ways. I desire to acknowledg the Lord's . . . who hath never failed me in this work of his. It is meete that I should informe you of the state of this work that your prayers may be with the more particular faith and fervor, be breathed forth at the throne of grace, in the behalf of this work, and those who labour therein. I cannot be so particular as I would, by reason straights of time, the ship being quickly to sail after I have received your

lets. if the Lord give you opportunity of going to Excestor, or of intercourse wh revnd Mr Nichols by him you may heare somewhat more than I can now wright unto your self, the revnd ministers, and christian people there having now these two years contributed towards this work, and by whose supply a great pt of the work for the civile pt in charges and expenses hath been carried on. After several years speaking to them, the Lord opened their hearts to desire baptism . . . and to desire church estate and ministry, whereby to enjoy all God's ordinances, and to enjoy cohabitation and civile govnmt, as subservient unto, and greatly conducing unto the spiritual ways and mercys—in this order they have been taught—they may have visible civility before they can rightly injoy visible sanctities in ecclesiastical communion. Now we looked out a place fit for to begin a towne, where a . . . numbr of people might have subsistence togethr—in the year 50, we began that work through rich grace. in the year 51 in a day of fasting and prayer they entered into a covenant wth God and each othr to be ruled by the Lord in all theire affaires civilian making the Word of God theire only magna charta, for govmnt, laws, and all conversation and chose rulers of Bands—of 50. and of an hundred.—the platforms of wh holy governmt of Gods own institution, I have sent over this yeare unto Mr Nicols for the reverend elders in exon, and if the Lord give you opportunity I should gladly wish your self might also have a sight of it, that I might receive your . . . animadvsions on it, but in my poor thoughts I appryhend it would be a mercy to England, if they should in this hour of time take up that forme of govmt wh is a divine institution, and by wh christ should reigne over them, by the word of his mouth. but I forget my selfe. I am speaking of

the Indians whom I desire to traine up to be the Lords people only, ruled by his Word in all things, and the Lord hath blessed them in this theire govm^{nt} and guided them in judgm^{t}. This first yeare . . . and prepare them for holy church covenant whereby they give up themselves to be governed by the Lord ecclesiastically, in all his ordinances and church administrations, but I shall walk by good advice before I do this ; they are now building themselves a meeting house wh when it is made, it may please the Lord to call them forth to be built a spiritual house unto the Lord.

Touching w^{t} you say of my wrighting for a supply of books for my brother Mahu it is true I did so, but soone after the Lord was pleased to offer a comfortable supply both to him, and me also, for I bought two librarys of two ministers who left us and they are both paide for, by the Corporation in London, and my broth^{r} Mahu hath beene possessd of his a good while, besides the revern^{d} elds. ministers of exon have sent unto us new supply, and this yeare they sent unto us the 2nd edition of the new annotations upon the whole bible, so through the riches of Gods bounty he is now supplyed but w^{t} particular books he may further want I cannot tell. S^{r} you make mention of a liberal gift of a religious gentleman, whose name I hope I shall hereafter know that I may expresse my thankfullness in a few lines unto him and whereas you require to know in what comodity, it may be most suitably laid out I anse^{r} in two comoditys chiefly first in strong linen cloth, canvas, and oth^{r} good hempen cloth and lokroms,[1] because in the hot sumors the Indians delight to goo in linnon, and work, if in any garm^{t}, only a linnon garment, if they can get it.

[1] Locram is a coarse cloth imported from Brittany, from the town of Locrenan.

2ly in red, blew, or white cottons, course and thick, some call it trading cloth wh is the coursest. and some better. Only these two sorts of comoditys are best for the . . . the way of sending may be by ships from Barstable, who have often se hithr, or by some Bristol ships who also trade hithr, if by London then there is a faithfull friend of mine Mr Butcher, who will conveigh any such things to me, but it may be the goods had better be taken up in your country, than to be bought in London Sr I do also request this, that if any ships come from Barstable you would please to appoynt some or othr discente and Godly men, able to judg wisely and . . . to set apt so much time, as to see with his eyes, and heare with his owne ears how the matters are here and what is done among the Indians, and should he have a good allowance for his paines, it would tend much to the furtherance of or work and comfort of your work, and may you please to communicate this my motion to revnd Mr Nicols and considr wt to be done in that case, nay if some of the churches should send forth a minister, and othr faithfull brethren on purpose to visit, and comfort, and incourage such a work, I see not, but it were a worthy work, and well becoming the Spirit of the gospel—but I can now go no further. I do humbly bless the Lord for the prayers that are made in all the Churches in the behalfe of this work, and us who labour in it. I beg for the continuance thereoff and so commending you and all your holy labours unto the Lord, and to the blessing of his grace I rst

your unworthy fellow labourer
in the gospel of Christ
JOHN ELIOT.

Roxbury this 19t
of the 5t 52.

LETTER II, Dated 7th of the 8th Month 1652.

REVERNd AND MUCH RESPECTED IN CHRIST

I recd letts from you full of love, both in acknowledgmt and incouragmt in this work of the Lord among the Indians to wh last I have by the former ship returned answr according as you desired, but lest these letts should faile and miscary coming so far, and through so many hands before they can come at you, therefore I thought it necessary to write by this ship also, as I shall by the next likewise if the Lord give optunity. your loving expression about books I thus answerd tt through the goodnesse of God, wants are well supplyed by the purchase of two librarys one for my brothr Mahew, the other for my selfe, as also Revernd Mr Nicols of Excetor wth the rest of the revernd ministers there and christian people have made a good supply unto us both in books blessed be the Lord and blessed be they. for the fittest disposal of tt 5li you mention, because or Indians are now come to cohabitation and labour, they much delight in linnen to work in, in the summer especially, if therefore it be laide out in good canvas and other good strong linnen for shirts, and some for some cotton about head cloathes etc. it will best accomodate us for the present—unless some be laide out in thick warme white blanket cloth wh I think is plentyfully made in your country, such things will best suit us. for the way of sending it, I desire it may be by your . . . shipping, and if none be bound for the Bay of Massachusett yet if any be bound for the Ild of Shoals, the great fishing place of N.E. it may be safely conveighed unto me for the minister who prcheth there is named Mr Brock, a godly man, unto whom the care being comited I doubt not but he will carefully send them unto me, or if they be

bound to any other port with us, lets and goods sent unto me who am of Roxbury, will easyly be notified, and conveighed. if anybody of trust have the care . . . comited to them. the present state of or busynesse is through the grace of christ come up to this, that upon the 13th day of this month (if God will) we have a day of fasting and prayer, wherein we shall call forth sundry Indians to make confession of Jesus Christ his truth and grace whose confessions, if they to charity appear to be such as were not revealed to them by flesh and blood, but by the fathr then we shall proceed to build them into a visible constituted church for the injoyment of Christ in all his holy ordinances.

Now this businesse is pressing on, and filleth me so wth ocupan as tt I cannot attend much to writing Sr I earnest beg your prayers, and the prayers of all the people of the Lord, and so comending you, and all your holy labours unto the Lord's blessing and mercy—I rst

your affectionate brothr and
fellow labourer in
the Lords vinyard
JOHN ELIOT.

Roxbury this 7t of the 8t month 1652.
Sr

in my formr letr I was bold to move tt if the Christian people who are now contributors to this good work of the Lord would please to send over some godly messenger who may see wth his eyes what is done . . . wh they have bestowed, it may much tend to theire satisfaction, and incouragemt in so great and good a work as this is.

THE BILL OF LADING OF GOODS REFERRED TO.

1653.

Invoyce of Goods Sente on ye May. Flower of Boston (Master Thos. Webber) for Boston in New England consigned onto Mr. John Eliott Pastor of ye Church of Roxbury fr Mr. Jonathan Hamner, ye Cost and Chardges, viz.

	£	s.	d.
#1 Ballott of Canvas Nr 3 qr 180 Awnds[1] Cost	010	14	09
#1 Ballott of Canvas nr 6 qr: 210 awnds cost	016	04	04
#100 yards of Course Dowlis[2] at 10½d p yd is	004	07	06
#Chardges paide on those Goods at Bristoll is	000	05	08
	031	12	03
#2 qts of Tourkinge[3] Cloth of 45 yds: ys. white cost	16	00	00
#pd for canvas and packinge ye Tourkinge[3] cloth	000	05	06
#pd for Cartidge to ye Water Side . .	000	00	08
#pd for Carryadge of ye Canvas from Bristoll	000	14	00
#pd for makeinge bills of entry and clearinge ye Canvas at ye Custome House . .	000	03	06
#pd for Custome of 50 ells of Canvas, entered short	000	02	08
#pd for portidge, cartidge, craneidge, boatidge and warfidge, and warehouse roome for ye Canvas	000	04	08
#pd for Warehouse rooms, Warfidge, portidge Craneidge and boatidge for ye 2 qrs Tourk-Cloth	000	04	08
#pd for fraight, primadge, and	002	11	00
#pd Severall petty chardges on those goods .	000	00	08
Sum is	051	19	07
pd out of mony Nuttall forming a Certificate fr ye Shippinge out ye 2 ballotts of Canvas at shippinge office in london .	00	00	06
	52	00	1

[1] Awns, i.e. French ells.

[2] This again is Breton fabric from Dulas in Brittany: it is the cloth that made Falstaff so angry: "Dowlas, filthy dowlas".

[3] Cloth dyed light blue, the Turkey blue of the day: the form is from the Italian *turchino.*

LETTER III, Dated 29t of the 6t —54.

REVEND AND MUCH RESPECTED IN THE LORD

That liberal gift of that Christian Gentleman, Mr. Spragot, and his religious familie wth your owne exceeding great love, care, paine and travaile about the same I did by the blessing of the Lord receive, safe and in good condition, in the end of the yeare 53 wh the Lord sent me at such a season, as tt it was a singular comfort unto us, and furtherance of the work, provision for winter clothing and a support to the work all this spring, untill such time as the Lord affordeth us some more supplys and I doo send not only my thanks for all this love, but also an account of the improvmt thereof unto the ends you appoynted the same and I have sent here inclosed one account to your people and the same I have sent to Mr Spegot himselfe inclosed in his letr wh I request you to delivr to him. It pleaseth God thus to owne and blesse the work, they come forward in civility ; there is in them agreat measure of natural informity and ingeniosity only it is drowned in their wild and rude manner of living, but by culture, order, governmt and religion they begin to be furbished up, and drawn forth unto some good imploymts, and by Gods blessing I hope they will be in these civile respects raised to some good improvmt. Religion is on the gaineing hand (I blesse the Lord) though in Church estate and affaires of ecclesiastical polity they come on but slowly but in these matters they doo as they are orderd and guided by counsel, and not according to theire owne notions. I hope you have seen theire confessions wh they made in the yeare 52, and the reasons of our proceeding no further at that time, in the yeare 53 I did not move at all that way for some special

reasons, only some . . . against this present yeare. This yeare 54 we have had anothr meeting about it: viz. for the examination of the Indians in poynt of knowledge in the doctrinal pt of religion, they were examined principally by the Elders of the churches about us, as also by any other Christian man, who thought good to propound any question to them, as some did for it was an open and free conference, tt so tr might be the fuller satisfaction given to all tt desired the same in conclusion whereof the Elders did give testymony of theire good satisfaction in what they had received from them, but a more particular relation of this days meeting, I have sent over to the Corporation to be publisht togethr wth the present state we stood in, touching or furthr guiding in gathring them into a church estate and covenant unto wh I must make bold to refer you for fuller information. Also the laste yeare I sent over the Indians thanks unto the Christian people of Engl: for theire love, also a relation of some judgmts, as the rulers have executed upon sinners wh I hope are published, wherin may be seen theire care to leade a conversation according to the word of God, and the light they have received Sr my times are filled wth ocupan, and cannot inlarge furthr. I intreat the continuance of your prayers unto the Lord for us all and for me and so comending you and all your holy labours unto the Lord I rest

Your loving brothr and
fellow labourer in the
Lords vinyarde
JOHN ELIOT.

Roxbury this 29t of the 6t. 54.

Now let us return to the "Mayflower" and her voyage to Boston in 1653.

That the "Mayflower" was at this time plying between London and Boston appears by another curious discovery, brought to light by students of American records. It appears from this that on 6 October, 1652, "Thomas Webber, Mr of the good shipp called the 'Mayflower' of the burden of two hundred Tons or thereabouts . . . Riding at Ancor in the Harbour of Boston, sold one-sixteenth of the Ship for good and valluable Consideracons, to Mr. John Pinchon, of Springfield Mrcht."

The next day, 7 October, 1652, the same "Thomas Webber, Mr of the good Shipp called the 'Mayflower' of Boston in New England, now bound for the Barbadoes and thence to London," acknowledges an indebtedness to Theodore Atkinson, a wealthy hatter, felt-maker and merchant of Boston.

And the same day (7 October, 1652) "the said Thomas Webber, Mar of the good shipp called the 'Mayflower' of the burthen of Two hundred tons or thereabouts, sold unto Theodore Atkinson felt-maker, one sixteenth, as well of said shipp as of all and singular her masts, sails, sailyards etc. etc.".

So here we have again Thomas Webber and his ship, the good ship "Mayflower" plying between Boston and London, one year before the date of our Bill of Lading.[1]

Azel Ames, from whose book we have taken these references, remarks that "it is of course possible that this was the historic ship, though, if so, reappearing twenty-two years after her last known voyage to New England. If the same, she was apparently under both new master and owner."

But this change of ownership need not surprise us.

[1] See Azel Ames, *The 'Mayflower' and Her Log*, p. 97.

We actually have under our very eyes a gradual change of ownership going on : for Thomas Webber is evidently in financial straits and is selling two-sixteenths of his ship. What happened then may easily occur on the wider scale, before and after the Webber ownership.

CHAPTER III.

THE "MAYFLOWER" IN THE EAST INDIES?

OUR navigation now becomes more difficult ; we have established three dates for possible Atlantic sailings of the "Mayflower". Can we find any further records which may reasonably be referred to the same ship? Any more stations on the way to the ooze or the ship-breaker's yard? At this point we are started on a new quest by my friend Dr. D. S. Cairns, who informed me privately that he remembered, when a student at Edinburgh, reading in a copy of the *Spectator* that Sir Edwin Arnold had said that the "Mayflower" was wrecked on the Malabar Coast, having been taken into the East India Company's service ; he was not quite sure whether it was Sir Edwin Arnold who had made the statement, or the *Spectator* who made it for him and over him ; but he was quite sure of the statement, and there was photographed distinctly in his mind that in the very same connection there was a further statement about a coin of Severus which had been struck at York. These clues were worth following up, and it will be seen that, in the inquiry, there is good opportunity for estimating the weight of traditional evidence and the trustworthiness of an excellent memory. The "Mayflower" clues were three ; the *Spectator*, Sir Edwin Arnold, and a coin of Severus. My first attempt was made upon the *Spectator*, and resulted in the detection of the following passage in Sir Edwin Arnold's *Seas and Lands*, ed. 2,

p. 109: the volume was reviewed by the *Spectator*, and furnished upon examination the following passage, which was part of an address made at Harvard University in the year 1889 on Indian Literature. Speaking of the cultivation of Sanskrit studies at Harvard, he said: "India belongs to you in the sense in which she belongs to us, and I rejoice that you are preparing to share our rights. Do you know that the 'Mayflower' which brought your ancestors hither, went down in Indian waters off Masulipatam? Raise her some day in fancy and freight her with a glorious cargo of fresh investigations from Massachusetts Bay, wherein we shall find the Old World interpreted by the New World, and American scholars out-doing the best of England and Germany."

My friend, Professor Lanman, in whose interest as Professor of Sanskrit the appeal to the Harvard students to cultivate the ancient Indian literature was made, will probably remember the occasion.

Upon my drawing the attention of Dr. Cairns to the foregoing statement as to the "death" of the "Mayflower," he was quite positive that this was not the passage referred to: he might have been incorrect in saying "Malabar Coast" when it should have been "Coromandel" Coast (Masulipatam lies North of Madras and near the Bay of Bengal), but he was quite positive that his information came from the *Spectator itself*, and upon second thoughts, that it was in the year 1886-7, or 1887-8 that he saw the article. So we went back to the search with the fresh clue in the form of a suspicion that Sir Edwin Arnold had perhaps picked up the information in India, perhaps in Masulipatam itself. Now on looking at the other direction of exploration, that indicated by the coin of Severus struck at York, I became very sceptical about the existence of any such coin.

Numismatists do not admit any genuine coin of Severus struck at York, and why should Sir Edwin Arnold or the *Spectator* be interested in a forgery? If it was a real coin which Sir Edwin Arnold had come across, perhaps it was something which had turned up among the occasional finds of early Roman coins in India. These finds are of great importance to the historians as they furnish evidence that the trade between Rome and the south of India goes back to very early times, far back into the first century, at all events. So I began to look into the record of these hoards, and for that purpose to examine the catalogue of Roman coins actually preserved in the Madras Museum. I soon found that what my friend Dr. Cairns had referred to was not a coin of Severus at all, but, as I had half suspected, a victory coin of Claudius over Britain: the evidence is as follows: in Thurston's Catalogue of *Roman, Indo-Portuguese and Ceylon Coins in the Madras Museum*, the following passages will be found:—

"There was a find of Roman gold coins in 1850 on the Malabar Coast near Cannanore, which was described by Colonel Drury in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* for 1802: vol. xx., pp. 371-87. It appears that they were accidentally discovered in the search for gold dust by the gradual clearing away of the soil on the slope of a small hill in the neighbourhood of Cottayam, a village about ten miles to the eastward of Cannanore."

On No. 15 of these coins, Thurston makes the following notes from Drury:—

"15. *Obverse:* TI. CLAVD. CÆSAR. AVG.
P.M. TR.P. VI. IMP. XI.
Head of Emperor.
Reverse: DE BRITANN. Triumphal Arch.
Emperor mounted with trophies,

a most interesting coin representing the arch erected by a decree of the Senate to the Emperor Claudius on the final subjugation of Britain. It was in the year A.D. 43 that the Emperor Claudius sent over a large force to conquer the island, which he subsequently joined himself, Vespasian, afterwards Emperor, being his second in command. This triumphal arch no longer exists, and were it not for the representation of it on coins, we should have remained in ignorance of its ever having been erected."

To this note of Colonel Drury's the following foot-note is added: "Concerning this coin Sir Edwin Arnold says (*India Revisited*, 1886, p. 260): 'Among the curious treasures of the Madras Museum, which the Governor (Sir M. E. Grant-Duff) has greatly developed, is a golden coin of Claudius, the Emperor, struck to commemorate the conquest of Britain, and discovered in excavating a foundation near Madras. What chapters of fancy might be written about this *aureus*, which thus strangely links the past and present of England's history, and came, perhaps, to India in the scrip of S. Thomas.'"

On turning to *India Revisited*, at the page indicated by Thurston, I found as follows, after the quotation about the *aureus*: "The only fact that could be mentioned by me, at all to match the odd thoughts suggested by this coin, with its device *ob Britannos devictos*—in connection with the same locality, was one regarding the famous old ship 'Mayflower,' which bore the Pilgrim Fathers to New England. It has recently been ascertained that this vessel was chartered in A.D. 1659 by the East India Company, and went to Masulipatam from Gombroon for a cargo of rice and general produce. She was lost upon the voyage home, one of the ships whose

history is linked with the birth and uprise of great nations, like the *aureus* in the Madras Museum."

Here, then, we had the missing quotation connecting the "Mayflower" and the Roman coin: and the date of death of the "Mayflower" is added. Is it to this *aureus* that Sir Edwin Arnold devotes the lines at the head of Thurston's catalogue as follows?—

> "What! a gold coin amid these jewelled treasures.
> Why send me such a relic?"—So you say.
> "Good to enhance some antiquary's pleasures,
> Stamped for dead people in a buried day!"
>
> True now, but look a little! If one ponder
> The legend of this piece, its gold may shine
> With lustre leaving dull the gems of wonder,
> Which I did lay in those dear hands of thine.
> An aureus of the Roman Empire—See.

Arnold's account of the discovery of the coin is, however, imaginary. It was not found in digging foundations, nor near Madras.

As to the date of the deposit, the coins run to Nero and then jump abruptly to Antoninus Pius. If the last coin, a single one, belong to the hoard, the date suggested is the middle of the second century or thereabouts. If the coin does not belong to the hoard, the date suggested is A.D. 70 or so. In either case, not in the scrip of S. Thomas, who, if he visited India at all, must have done so in A.D. 54. So much for the accuracy of Sir Edwin Arnold.

The verses on the *aureus* which Thurston prefixed to his catalogue will be found in Sir Edwin Arnold's *Lotus and Jewel*, 1887, p. 132. The coin described is not, as might have been supposed, the *aureus* of Claudius, but one of Marcus Aurelius. The poem is reprinted in

the collection *In My Lady's Praise* being poems written to the honour of Fanny, Lady Arnold (1889, p. 92).

Now let us return to our ship, and see if we can further re-write the history of her fortunes or misfortunes. We left her in the Atlantic in 1653.

Our first discovery on the new line of investigation suggested by Sir Edwin Arnold is the existence of another fallacious "Mayflower," which was anchored in the Persian Gulf in 1653, a date at which it is quite impossible to reconcile her with the position of the real "Mayflower," which we have seen to be on the Atlantic at that very time. Apparently the ship in question had been hired by the East India Company and had reached the Persian Gulf by way of Surat, which is the principal station of the Company in the days before Bombay was acquired from the Portuguese at the marriage of Charles II. The following extracts from the correspondence of the Company will illustrate the matter. On 27 September, 1653, the factors at Ispahan report as follows to the President and Council at Surat :—

"One of his vessels (piloted by Mr. Mason, who was afterwards taken in the 'Roebuck') was so inserviceable that Cherry sold her ; as he would have done the other, called the 'Mayflower' and piloted by John *May* (since gone home overland), but no one would buy her, because the Dutch would not promise a pass for her. So she is now with the 'Endeavour' at Ormus, and one Mr. Beard, that came in her or her consort, is looking after her. The reason why they did not seize upon her was because she was likely to prove more expensive that profitable : besides, they could not tell how soon they might lose her to the Dutch."[1] On 28 October,

[1] *English Factories in India*, 1651-1654, p. 203 ; *Original Correspondence* (O.C. 2339).

1653, Messrs. Spiller and Daniel at Ispahan write to Young and other factors proceeding to Gombroon to discharge the Lascars from the "Mayflower" at once, and to send up any letters that had been brought on from Surat.[1]

On 16 January, 1654, President Blackman and Edward Peirce at Surat write to the factors in Persia to sell the "Mayflower" for whatever she would fetch.[2] They repeat the direction on 14 February, 1654: the "Mayflower" should be sold. Beard may be paid his wages till the time she was blockaded by the Dutch; but for the rest, as he is not the Company's servant, he should be referred to the owners of the vessel.[3]

The letter appears to have been crossed by one from John Spiller at Astraf to the factors at Gombroon, dated 26 February, 1654. He has evidently been asked about Mr. Beard's wages, but knows nothing on the subject. He suggests that the "Mayflower" should be trimmed, presumably to make her sail better.[4] On 21 February, 1654, the factors at Gombroon, Messrs. Young, Park and Otgher write to the Company that they have not yet succeeded in selling the "Mayflower," and the same people write on 4 March, 1654, to the President and Council at Surat to say that the "Mayflower" has been sold, and that Beard has gone to Ormus to hand her over.[5]

This phantom ship now disappears. She had been hired in London and had been sent to the East with a consort. Apparently the contract allowed the Company or the ship's master under certain circumstances to

[1] *English Factories in India*, 1651-1654, p. 208, and O.C. 2344.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 221, and O.C. 2359.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 227, 228, and O.C. 2362. [4] O.C. 2363.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 234, 244, and O.C. 2366, 2368.

sell her, and the troubles with the Dutch furnished the occasion. Her pilot went home overland, a long and dangerous journey. As we have said, the historic "Mayflower" cannot have been intended by the description. Perhaps the pilot had given his name to the ship that he was in charge of.

We come now to another ship "Mayflower," hired by the East India Company and despatched to the Coromandel Coast and to Sumatra in the beginning of January, 1656. The ship returned in August, 1657, when she arrived at Plymouth and discharged part of her cargo; she went out again in February, 1658. We must examine her movements carefully as it is quite possible that this is our Pilgrim Ship, chartered for the East India Service. In that case it is possible that she may have been offered to the Company at an earlier date; for we find from the *Court Books* of the Company that on 12 September, 1651, thirteen ships were offered to the Service, of which one was named the "Mayflower": only four ships were accepted, and the "Mayflower" was not one of them. Her master was Captain Bell at this time.[1]

Later on in 1655 we find that the "Mayflower" (if it is the very same) was offered for the Eastern trade and accepted. Two other ships went with her, the "Eagle" and the "Endymion," and her captain was named White. The following details from the published *Court Minutes* or the MS. *Court Books* may be useful:—

"The 'Mayflower' (240 tons, 24 guns, and 55 men) offered by Captain White, is accepted to go to the (Coromandel) Coast at £18 10s. per ton for fine goods, and two pounds less for coarse, to be dispeeded by the

[1] *Court Minutes*, etc. (1650-1654), p. 122.

1st November next. . . . All these ships (the 'Eagle,' the 'Mayflower,' and the 'Endymion') on their return to await each other at St. Helena, so that they may come home together. Certain Committees to examine and report on the 'Mayflower' and the 'Endymion'."[1]

Permission was given to the owners of the "Mayflower" to do a little business on their own account, so that when the Company had freighted 240 tons, the owners could carry more pepper if the ship could stand it.[2]

Was this our "Mayflower"? Her traditional freight in 1620 was 180 tons, and her master in 1653 was Thomas Webber of Boston, and her freight 200 tons or thereabouts. She certainly did not carry twenty-four guns in 1620: but we are now in troublous times for ships going to the East. It is not impossible that the ship has had her carrying capacity and her naval equipment increased. Even at 240 tons she is still quite a small ship. Let us see what becomes of her.

On 16 November, 1655, the Company engaged a factor named Henry Watkins to go over in the "Mayflower": he was to receive £60 for the voyage, and a further consideration if he showed business ability, and he was made to give a bond for his fidelity of £500.[3] His tragic end is noted later.

Now comes the question as to the freight of the outward bound ships. The trade could not be readily carried on except in such currency (pieces of eight) which could be exchanged for Indian money and goods, so the Company obtained permission to export bullion, which in ordinary times was prohibited merchandise.

[1] *Court Minutes* (1655-1659), p. 57; *Court Book*, vol. xxiii., p. 463.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 65. [3] *Court Minutes*, p. 66; *Court Book*, p. 479.

Interesting light is thrown on the negotiations by a petition preserved in the *Public Record Office*, in which Robert Barratt and Major Robert Russell appeal for permission to ship 4000 pieces of eight in the same ship on their own account. The petition was endorsed in 5 December, 1655, and permission was granted on 11 December.[1]

The Company's petitions for the export of coin had been lodged at an earlier date; for we find in the *Proceedings of the Council of State* for 30 November, 1655, as follows:—

". . . The three following petitions are referred to the consideration of the Commissioners of the Customs . . . of the East India Company for licence to transport in the 'Eagle,' 'Mayflower,' and 'Endymion' foreign coin and bullion to the value of £15,000, Custom free as formerly."[2]

The squadron had not set sail in December, 1655; for in that month an appeal was made to the Company by the owners of the ship "Jonathan," which had met with some disaster, to take part of their freight to India for them: but the Company would not hear of it, would carry neither Officers nor freight for the "Jonathan," and wrote to Captain White warning him against having anything to do with the matter.[3]

Well, the squadron got away in January, 1656, and reached the "Coast" in safety; we come now to an extraordinary incident which happened off Masulipatam,

[1] *Court Minutes*, p. 69; *Public Record Office*, C.O. 77, vol. viii., No. 18.

[2] *Court Minutes, ut supra*, p. 68; *Public Record Office*, S.P. Dom. *Interregnum*, i., 76, p. 403.

[3] *Court Minutes* for 1655-1659, p. 71; *Court Book*, vol. xxiii., p. 484; *Letter Book*, vol. i., p. 329.

when the captain almost lost his life, and Mr. Watkins the factor, alluded to above, actually perished. The story is told as follows in the *Vestiges of Old Madras* in the Indian Records series, vol. i., p. 162: "The ship 'Mayflower,' from England, reached Fort St. George in June of the year 1656 with money for investment at Madras, Masulipatam, and the Bay. The Bengal factors having been withdrawn John Leigh was deputed to accompany the ship on her voyage northward. On the 24th July, the 'Mayflower' and two other vessels being ready to sail from Masulipatam, the commander, accompanied by most of the English residents, embarked in a large decked boat for the roadstead. The craft capsized on the bar, and all on deck were thrown into the sea. Those who were below found themselves imprisoned in a vessel floating bottom upwards. The accident occurred so suddenly that, incredible as it may seem, the air did not entirely escape. The boat, in fact, behaved somewhat as a diving-bell, and the lives of those confined in her were preserved for two hours until she grounded, when the occupants contrived to make their escape."

The despatch from the Company's agents at Fort St. George tells the story as follows:—

"The 'Mayflower' whose Master, Captain Whyte, having received his despatch from Metchlipatam (Masulipatam), was goeing off in a country boate with the prementioned Merchants and divers other friends, she grounded on the Barre, and was oversett in very shoale water; yet the freshes were so strong that they could not support themselves, but were vyolently carried into deep water, wherein perished Mr. John Leigh, Mr. Henry Watkins, and Mr. Martin Bradgate, notwithstanding the assistance of their servants, some of whom were drowned with them. . . . The rest, by God's mercy,

got all safe ashore, though with much difficulty, some having bin, as it were, buried under the overwhelmed boate above an houres space, and at last were redeemed out of the jawes of death by an extraordinary providence, the particular circumstances of which it would take too much tyme and paper to relate; therefore leave it to those who are eternally obliged to render thanks for so miraculous a deliverance, yet we may not omit to acknowledge even with admiration that infinite goodness which in the midst of affliction dispenseth mercy."

Among the persons thus strangely preserved was one Hugh Squier, who wrote an account of his experiences to a friend of his in London, named Abraham Hill. His letter is extant and forms part of a collection in the possession of Captain Peter Hill of the Royal Navy. It was published by Mr. R. H. E. Hill in *Good Words* for 1903, under the title *An Adventure in India in* 1656. So much for the accident to the shore-boat at Masulipatam.

The treasure which the "Mayflower" had brought out with her suffered loss on exchange for native coin and goods: and on 10 November, 1656, the agents at Fort St. George report to the Company at home as follows:—

"Ryalls of 8^{t} and all silver in Generall at a very low esteem; for though those your Worshipps sent out on the ship 'Mayflower' are very good, yet can we hardly put them off at 18 for 10 new pagodas, and in Metchlipatam scarce 2½ for an old pagoda."[1] No doubt the financiers in the bazaars had the best of the transaction in changing coins with the Europeans.

On 26 August, 1657, the "Mayflower" arrived home at Plymouth, and proceeded to discharge her

[1] O.C. 2579.

cargo: and on 28 August[1] a letter reached the East India Company in London announcing the fact.[2]

If this is really the "Mayflower" of 1620, it is interesting to think of her as lying again in that beautiful harbour after more than thirty years of arduous ship-life.

On 29 August the officials of the Company sent a letter to their agent at Plymouth, one John Madock (sometime mayor of the town), complaining of the incivility of Captain White.

"Thank him for his letter of the 26th instance, and for the packet returned in the 'Mayflower'. Her commander not thinking them 'worthy of a few lines,' they desire Madock to inquire of him what progress he made in the voyage, whether he put into St. Helena or Ascension, what shipping left the Coast of Coromandel before or with him, and what is to follow. Request him to assist the commander in getting some convoy or company to sail with him from thence, and send any news he can gather either from the master or the ship's company."[3]

Meanwhile, it appears that the discharge of the cargo, in part at least, was accompanied by an evasion of custom house duties; the Company was evidently uncomfortable, and write to Madock to search the custom house books, and see what goods have actually been paid for, and if goods had been landed without being entered. He is to follow the same procedure as he had done in the case of "Endymion". The mention of the sister-ship of the "Mayflower" suggests that there had

[1] This is very rapid posting.

[2] *Court Minutes* for 1656-1659, pp. 160, 161; *Court Book*, vol. xxiii., p. 591.

[3] *Letter Book*, under date.

been cozening or smuggling as a bad habit on the part of homeward-bound ships.[1] They write again on the 1st December to say that they find the list of entries in the custom house of goods from the "Mayflower" so inconsiderable that they cannot but think, the said ship being so long at Plymouth, that a far greater quantity was disposed of than was entered![2]

There are further complaints: the pepper brought home was inferior in quality, and committees were set to look into the matter.[3] Then there was a dispute over the charter-party of the vessel which had to be settled by arbitration:[4] and another for "dead freight" for which the factors were to be brought to book, the sorry knaves that they were.[5]

The administrators of the estate of the late Mr. Henry Watkins, who was drowned off Masulipatam, came to collect £60 due to him, as supercargo of the vessel.[6]

When all these questions had been settled and the vessel cleared, the result was so satisfactory from a shareholder's point of view, that the Company readily accepted the suggestion to try another voyage with the "Mayflower". At a *Court of Committees* held on 22 December, 1657, it was resolved: "The 'Mayflower' is offered and accepted for employment, on condition she is found suitable; and John Proud and Henry Johnson are desired to examine and report upon her and the

[1] *Court Minutes*, p. 187; *Letter Book*, vol. i., p. 369.

[2] *Court Minutes*, p. 194.

[3] *Court Book*, vol. xxiii., p. 609 (23 Oct., 1657).

[4] *Court Minutes*, p. 187; *Court Book*, vol. xxiii., p. 621 (16 Nov., 1657).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 203; *ibid.*, p. 623 (23 Dec., 1657).

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 177; *ibid.*, p. 612 (28 Oct., 1657).

other ships to be employed, before any conclusion is come to with their respective owners.[1]

On 14 January, 1658, a certificate of efficiency being received, she is to be held ready for the East so as to be sent home in time to save the monsoon. On 18 January it is decided that she is to go to the Coromandel Coast, to Jambi, to Bantam, and then home. Her captain is now named Curtis, and he purposes to make it his last voyage.[2]

She is to carry bullion as previously: and on 22 February, 1658, it was resolved "that £20,000 be sent in 'Love,' £10,000 in the 'Merchant's Delight,' £7,500 in the 'Mayflower,' and £7,500 in the 'Gilbert,' and that all the ships shall be double-sheathed".[3] On looking more closely at the terms under which this new voyage was to be made, we find her now described as a ship of 300 tons burthen. The minute of 22 December, 1657, says so definitely: "The 'Mayflower,' burthen 300 tunnes, to be ready sometime in February next, or in January, if it may be". It appears that she has gained 50 tons in her burthen. The estimates are clearly approximate, and this shows that no final argument lies against identifying her with the "Mayflower" of 1620 on the score of tonnage. A few more details may be gathered from the *Court Books* of the Company with regard to this voyage. On 19 January, 1658, some difficulty arose between the owners of the "Mayflower" and the Company as to the route that was to be followed. They showed an unwillingness to undertake the voyage, but the Court declined to reconsider the matter.[4]

On the 22nd of January, 1658, the owners of the "Mayflower" came into court and proposed a voyage

[1] *Court Book*, vol. xxiv., p. 30.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 57, 62.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 76.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

to Acheen, the Coast and the Bay, with Captain Curtis in command : this was accepted.[1]

By later dispatches we find that it was late in November, 1658, before the "Mayflower" anchored in the roadstead of Masulipatam : apparently she started for home in January, 1660, two other of the Company's ships being dispatched about the same time ; but she was not seaworthy, and turned back to the Indian Coast and anchored at Swally Hole, the port of Surat. From thence she seems to have been sent up the Persian Gulf, where she was finally sold to an Indian speculator. Complaints were sent out from home as to her non-arrival, and explanations were returned from Fort St. George (Madras) and from Surat. In passing out of the hands of the Company a case for arbitration was raised with the owners of the "Mayflower," and was finally settled by a payment of £2,200 on the part of the Company.

The documentary proofs of these statements are as follows :—

22 Oct., 1661 (*Court Book*, vol. xxiv., p. 416).

According to a former consent of a reference between the Company and the owners of the "Mayflower" to conclude all disputes and differences between them there was nominated by the owners (names :) and by the Company (names :)

Jan. 8th, 1661/2 (*Court Book*, p. 445) refers again to that Committee of Arbitration.

March 26th, 1662 (*Court Book*, p. 754). Warrants were now signed for payments of 2200. 0. 0. Owners of the "Mayflower".[2]

[1] *Court Book*, vol. xxiv., p. 62.

[2] This is the last entry in this *Court Book*, which goes up to April, 1665. The next *Court Book* does not appear to contain any "Mayflower" references.

For further information we turn to the Correspondence Books where we find as follows :—

"O.C. 26. From Fort St. George. Jan. 11. 1660/1.

"RIGHT WORPl AND OUR HONble EMPLOYERS :

"By your 3 freighted ships 'Merchant's Delight,' 'Marygold' and 'Mayflower' dispeeded from your port of Madraspa for England this last year we presented our dutyee in 3 of our letters of the 11th, 24th, and 25th of Jan. 1659/60. The two first wee hope ere this have atteyned their reception, nor shall make repetition of anything therein, because Coppies of our said Missives are now remitted in our book of Registers, as well as what we advised on the 'Mayflower'. Which ship bore up after she was neare . . . advanced in her voyage to Cape Bon Esperance and to mend her defects she made for Swalley Hole in which places by the . . . advices of the (Margin: 'Mayflower' arrived in Swally Hole the 19th of Sept: 1660) President and Counsell, and others from Capt. Curtis, wee understand shee arrived the 19th September last, and in her way at Joanna took in such men (margin: takes in the men and treasure of the 'Smirna Merch' that was cast away on John de Novo). and treasure as was saved out of the 'Smyrna Merchant' that perished between the maine and St. Sauveure, on an island called St. John de novo, as per copy of Captain Fisher's letter now before you, declaring the full circumstances of said disaster . . .

. . . . . .

In reference to what you are pleased to mention about the 'Mayflower' that you expected her home, and make strange that she now dispeeded for Persia. To this yore Worps cannot but remember that her designe

from England to Atcheena to be filled with pepper was frustrated by the Dutch their beseiging of it, and it was the latter end of November 1658 before she anchored in the Matchlipa [Masulipatam] road, and then the yeare being so far spent, it was tyme for some employm^{t} or other to be thought upon for her. . . .

. . . . . .

The whole 'Persia Merchant's' cargo was provided before we knew of her losse, nor had we that ill newes till the 6th of October which you know was then too late to send a ship through the straightes of Mallacca, if the 'Merch^{t} Delight' or 'Mayflower' had beene in the road as you seem to intimate: but the latter was then at Acheen, and the other in Bay Bengalah."

The foregoing dispatch explains very clearly the delays to which the "Mayflower" had been subject. In sending her to Surat provision had to be made for forwarding her cargo by some other ship. This was done by transferring it to the "Richard and Martha" as the following dispatch will show :—

"O.C. 26. From Rajapo 16th Feb. 1660/1.

"RIGHT WORP^{l}:

"Our humble service being presented and you may please to understand y^{t} our severalls sent by your shipps 'Richard and Martha' and 'Blackmore' bore date of 18th November, and 10th and 11th December, which were our last, and will we hope come safe to your hands by the safe arrivall of the aforesaid shipps which God grant.

"The 'Eagle's' non-arrivall together with the necessity of sending home the 'Mayflower's' cargo was the cause of the 'Richard and Martha's' going home, contrary to Mr. Andrews' desire, though consistent

with reason, and we are glad shee is gone, and should rejoyce the 'Eagle' were come; losse we do not feare, but behind that those corsse strong unexpected windes that have blowne this last Monsoone, hath forced her to winter at St. Lawrence, from whence she may set sail in April and arrive at this Coast in May, if not we hope she will arrive in September with the next Europe shipping.

"The 'Mayflower,' although not the Company's ship yet we must advise you was bought by somebody under the name of Deoldas 2nd Broker to Chout in Suret and although she was condemned insufficient for a home-bound voyage, yet if another course be not taken she will rayne so long here as may prove more prejudiciall to you than her going home could have done.

. . . . . .

So the good ship passed into the hands of a native broker at Surat.

"Her Captain (Capt. Curtis) went home in the 'Richard and Martha' taking some calicoes for sale on his own account, and was very displeased that they charged him £50 for his passage, though he was in commission of the Company. They did not play fair: *clericus clericum non decumat.* John Hart, the mate of the 'Mayflower,' also came home with Curtis, and he also did a little trade on his own account."

I believe this is all that the East India Company's records tell about the "Mayflower". The story does not tally with Sir Edwin Arnold's statements: he says, "it has recently been ascertained that she was chartered in A.D. 1659 by the East India Company". This is not correct: she was chartered in 1655 and again in

January, 1658. He continues: "She went to Masulipatam from Gombroon for a cargo of rice and general produce": there is no evidence of this: she went to Masulipatam from Acheen and the Straits of Malacca. Finally Sir Edwin Arnold says, "she was lost upon the voyage home". We have shown that she was not lost upon the voyage home, but made the harbour of Surat and was sold to a native broker.

In his address to the Harvard students, Sir Edwin Arnold said that the "Mayflower" went down in Indian waters off Masulipatam. This does not agree with his other statements as to her being wrecked on the voyage home, nor with our investigations: for it is clear that we are referring to the same ship, whether it is the original "Mayflower" or no.

Allowing for the possibility (nay, the probability) of mistakes in detail on the part of Sir Edwin Arnold, such as we noted in his description of the Madras coin, we have still the question to decide, whether the "Mayflower" was wrecked, as he suggests and reports. We have shown that it passed out of the ownership of the East India Company, so that no further information is likely from that quarter, unless it should be a report that their Eastern trade was rid of a rival whose competition had been feared. If Gombroon and Masulipatam are correct in Arnold's statement, they are two of the chief centres of the Company's trading: so that the loss of a rival ship might be readily reported by the Factors in writing their homeward missives. We have not, however, as yet found the dispatch to which reference must be made for the verification of Arnold's shipwreck.

The difficulties in the way of identification are not slight if we are to recognise in the East India Company's hireling of 1655 the original Pilgrim ship. First

of all, with regard to the identification with Thomas Webber's ship. We are definitely told that when he sold a part of his ownership in the ship she was of 200 tons or thereabouts. This agrees very closely with the traditional tonnage of the "Mayflower" (180 tons), so nearly as to be an equivalence: for with these trading ships the tonnage is just what the ship could be made to carry. Next we have the difficulty of tonnage identification with the ship chartered by the East India Company in 1655. She was engaged as a ship of 240 tons. The accounts show that she could carry more, for the Company gave the factors liberty to load extra freight after 240 tons had been put on board. They appear to have made good use of the permission, for, when the ship was re-chartered in 1657, there was a quarrel with them over dead freight on their return, and her rating was raised to 300 tons; it is clear that the same ship is intended. If her freight is in this way raised by 50 tons between two voyages, there is not the least difficulty in the rating of Thomas Webber's ship (assumed to be the original "Mayflower") as 200 tons, and a very small refitment of the ship's decks and bulwarks would make it possible to carry 240 tons. All these estimates are probably rough, they might mean little more than a statement of what the ship actually carried, or was thought capable of carrying. But this question of tonnage needs closer investigation.

Our next difficulty is the question of ownership and captains. We have already alluded briefly to this. There was a change of mastership between 1657 and 1658; the former master was Captain White, the second was Captain Curtis; the latter on accepting the position explained that it would be his last voyage, so that, if the ship had lived, there would have been another

change. Evidently we must not make too much difficulty over questions of *personnel.*

Then comes the question of Armaments. All of the merchant ships were armed in these days: there were pirates as well as professional enemies (French, Dutch, Portingalls): and the Indian Seas were more dangerous even than the Atlantic. Mr. Azel Ames makes an interesting calculation of the armament of the original "Mayflower". He quotes from Winslow[1] to the effect that when the "Speedwell" left Delfshaven, the emigrants gave those on the shore a volley of small shot and three pieces of ordnance. If the little "Speedwell" had at least three guns that could be put into action, the "Mayflower" might well have had three times as many. The "Lady Arabella," which was the "Admiral" of the convoy in 1630, had 28 pieces of ordnance on board: she was a ship of 350 tons burthen. Azel Ames thinks that the "Mayflower," in her evidently crowded condition, would hardly have mounted more than 8 or 10 guns. That is an admission that ten guns is an underarmament.[2]

How can we reconcile the probable naval equipment of the original "Mayflower" with the ship that in 1655 is described as being of 240 tons, 24 guns, and 55 men? If she crossed the Atlantic with 10 guns would she require 24 guns for the Straits or the Indian Ocean? The probability is against it: only we have to bear in mind that the Southern and Eastern Seas were particularly unsafe at this time from the constant quarrels with

[1] *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, 1646, p. 91.

[2] This does not include the guns which the Pilgrims brought with them which were probably in the hold. They were destined for the fortification of the new settlement, and were actually used for that purpose. Ames says that there were probably ten pieces of ordnance taken on board for this purpose.

the Dutch and the Portuguese. The Dutch had bigger ships than ours, and this fact alone would have suggested an increase of armament. In fact, the existence of a large armament would have been a factor in the acceptance of the ship by the Company. On the whole, however, the argument is against the identification.

CHAPTER IV.

THE "MAYFLOWER" AS WHALER.

OUR first survey of the "Mayflower" problem has resulted in the location of four ships so named, at four corresponding dates, viz. : the original Plymouth "Mayflower" of 1620, the Salem "Mayflower" of 1630, the Boston "Mayflower" of 1653, and the East Indian "Mayflower" of 1655 and 1657. It is doubtful, *a priori*, if these four are all the same ship : it is, for instance, in the highest degree improbable that a Boston ship should be trading to the East Indies : it is, therefore, improper to equate the third of the foregoing ships to the fourth ; again, it does not seem likely, *a priori*, that the original ship should go to the East Indies at so late a date in her history. The first and second ships are commonly identified ; but this proceeding has been sharply challenged by Mr. R. C. Marsden in the *English Historical Review* for 1904, who maintains that the "Mayflower" of 1630 was a new ship, possibly named after the first, and in part showing signs of the same ownership. If Mr. Marsden is correct, we may find that we have four ships in series without any identification between the members of the series. Evidently the problem requires a closer statement than we have given it. Each of the ships in question must be interrogated as to its history,

before and after the dates named; and if other similar ships turn up in the course of the inquiry they must be interrogated also. When we identify, it should be by tonnage, ownership, or mastership, or by some accidental agreements in freights and voyages.

One or two preliminary considerations may be helpful. We must not insist on too short a life for one of the wooden ships of the period. That they lived long may be seen by a variety of considerations. For example, in April, 1633, an enumeration was made of all the ships in the King's Navy by age and quality. It was found that the oldest ship in the navy was the "Adventure," and that she was built in 1594. So the "Adventure" was recognised to be still sea-worthy and battle-worthy after thirty-nine years of active service. What happened in the Royal Navy cannot be regarded as impossible in the Merchant Service, with which we are concerned. Mr. Thomas Webber's ship is not to be ruled out of our inquiry on the ground of age, nor even the ship that went to the East Indies.

The next thing to bear in mind is that we must not insist on too close an equivalent of tonnage. There were great discussions in the early part of the seventeenth century as to the proper way to rate a ship. The old-fashioned way was to find out how many tons she could carry: the newer method, of which there were several alternative schemes in competition, was to guess the solid content of the ship from her breadth, length of keel and depth, and then to allow a certain number of tons in proportion to her cubic content. It is obvious that a change in the method of rating would result in a variation of the registered tonnage. A ship might be rated at 170 tons under one system and at 240 tons under another. Small discrepancies, like that between the

tonnage of the original "Mayflower," and the tonnage of the Boston-Webber ship may be neglected. Then we may also prepare our mind for a certain amount of change in the ownership, mastership, or port of registry of any given ship. A very little study of the mercantile marine will show how ships changed hands, how captains were superannuated or replaced, and how the change of ownership had a tendency to affect the port of registry.

Let us now see what we can find out further with regard to any of the ships that we have brought into view.

We shall now endeavour to show that the original "Mayflower" was a whaling ship, and we shall try to trace her ownership for the major part of her history.

We have already alluded to the researches of Mr. R. C. Marsden with regard to the history of the Pilgrim Ship, both before and after 1620. These researches are incorporated in the *English Historical Review* for 1904, and are a contribution of the first importance for the story of the settlement of New England. They are the result of an immense amount of labour upon the *Admiralty Records*, and some of the results arrived at by Mr. Marsden appear to us to be incontrovertible. For instance, the common opinion of the historians has been that the shipmaster who took the "Mayflower" on her great voyage, was one Thomas Jones, a man with a very bad record, who is to be held responsible for the miscarriage of the Pilgrims, from the mouth of the Hudson, where they had designed to settle, to the territory of the Northern company of Virginia, and to Cape Cod. Mr. Marsden shows conclusively that the shipmaster was not Thomas Jones, who was at this very time on the way to Virginia in the "Falcon," but Christopher Jones, and that he owned one-fourth of the

ship.[1] We shall be able to confirm this presently in a variety of ways. The correction makes it possible to write a page or two of the "Mayflower" history before 1620, and some pages of a later date. What concerns us at the present point is Mr. Marsden's suggestion that the ship had been in the whale-fishery before 1620; and he quotes appropriately the following passage from Mourt's *Relation*, where the Pilgrims catch sight of the whales playing on the New England coast inside Cape Cod:—

"Our master and his mate and others experienced in fishing professed we might have made £3,000 or £4,000 worth of oil. They preferred it before Greenland whale-fishing, and propose the next winter to fish for whale here."

This surely implies that Jones (Christopher) was one of the owners, that he had been whale-fishing in Greenland (for how else could he have declared the superior attractiveness of a New England fishery, or been experienced in it?), and that he had formed the idea of an expedition for whales on the New England coast in 1621.

The *Relation* has a further note on the abundance of whales in Cape Cod harbour, as follows: "Cape Cod was like to be a place for good fishing; for we saw daily great whales, *of the best kind for oil and bone*, come close aboard our ship; and in fair weather play and swim about us. There was one once, when the sun shone warm, came and lay above water, as if she had been dead, for a good while together, within half a musket shot of the ship. At which two were prepared to shoot, to see whether she would stir or no. He that

[1] Arber had already shown that the shipmaster could not have been *Thomas* Jones; see *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, p. 392.

gave fire first, his musket flew in pieces, both stock and barrel; yet, thanks be to God, neither he nor anyone else was hurt with it, though many were there about. But when the whale saw her time, she gave a snuff and away!"

The words we have italicised show again the observation of the expert; and we need not doubt that Christopher Jones was a whaler and his ship a whaling-ship.

Mr. Marsden shows that Christopher Jones took the "Mayflower" to Drontheim in Norway in 1609, in search of tar, deals, and herrings. Thus he was Master of the ship eleven years at least before the voyage to New England. He died in 1622 (before 26 August), and his ship was appraised under an Admiralty order, for distribution of its value among the group of owners (including Mr. Jones' widow, who owned one-fourth part).

Mr. Marsden thinks from the small price set on the ship (£160) that she was now become unseaworthy. She should have been worth four or five times as much. The explanation appears to us to be very simple. The appraisement is for the widow's fourth part, and not for the whole ship. In that case, there is no reason why the "Mayflower" should have been broken up, and no reason why she should not have gone to Greenland after all. The object of the present chapter is to show that at least one ship "Mayflower," and perhaps two, did go whale-fishing in Greenland in this very period. Mr. Marsden has an inkling of this: only, as he distinguishes between the "Mayflower" of 1620 and the "Mayflower" of 1630, he prefers to believe that the ship which went to Greenland was the later vessel. We will leave that point undecided for the present. Let us first get to Greenland and see what we find there.

In order to do this we proceed via Yarmouth, where we shall find a "Mayflower" ready to sail, and be able to take passage in her. She is fully armed and is evidently going into contentious waters, for she has taken out letters of marque and reprisal against certain foreign shipping. The document which describes the issue of the warlike papers is as follows :—

23 July, 1626.	Name.	Tonnage.
Owner.	"Mayflower"	250.
Thomas Horth (= Howarth)	of Gt. Yarmouth.	
		Master.
		Walter Bullard.

The permit is renewed in the next year as follows :—

3 October, 1627.	Name.	Tonnage.
Owner.	"Mayflower"	240.
Thomas Horth and others.	of Gt. Yarmouth.	
		Master.
		Waster Pullord.

Clearly the same ship is intended, and the sailing is intermediate in date to the two "Mayflower" dates for New England.

Let us see what we can find out about this Mr. Thomas Horth (or Howarth) and his ship the "Mayflower".

Thomas Horth is a leading figure in the mercantile life of the seventeenth century ; we may describe him for the middle of that period as the merchant prince of Great Yarmouth. He was interested in all kinds of ventures with risks and high returns ; sometimes he was trading in coal, sometimes in fish, sometimes in whale-oil, and sometimes employing his part of the mercantile

marine, as suggested above, in the repression of piracy by quasi-piratical methods: every now and then we find the Parliament voting him large sums for services rendered, for he was an ardent Parliament-man, even if he could not always collect what was voted him; and sometimes we find him lending small sums on his own account to the Government of the Great Protector.[1] But it was in the Greenland whale-fishing that he found himself most at home, and it is in connection with that fishery that we shall come across the traces of the "Mayflower," to which letters of marque were issued in 1626. In that year, or perhaps somewhat earlier, Horth began to be a whaler; it was a comparatively new industry and a monopoly of it had been granted to a branch of the Muscovia Company, who called themselves the Greenland Adventurers, and claimed the exclusive right of fishing as the result of their discovery of that country and annexation of it to the British Crown in the days of King James I. Thus we have first of all a monopolist company (a common enough thing in those days) engaged in developing an infant industry which the Government undertook to protect, and in driving off anyone who had been on the ground before them. The history of Mr. Horth is the history of his relations to this Company; he was an adventurer on his own account, bringing Yarmouth ships and Yarmouth fishermen to the coast of Greenland, sometimes allying himself with the monopolists, and sometimes boldly resisting them. One way in which it became possible to hold his own, and get his ships loaded with whale-bone and blubber, was by allying himself not with the Mus-

[1] From S.P. Dom., 1654, 7 February, we find that he had supplied the Parliament with £500 in 1642, and with £300 for the Irish business.

covy Adventurers, but with a Scotch Company, to which a special patent had been granted, to fish whales on their own account, and to dispose of the oil to Scotch soap-boilers. No doubt the Scotch Adventurers had secured a strong position at the Court of King James VI. The Northern Kingdom could easily make out a convincing case for a second patent; no one could resist them with impunity; and we shall see presently how often Mr. Horth insinuated his ships under the Scotch patent, and did not always sell his oil in Scotland. When he could neither cajole the Greenland Company to divide the fishery with him, nor persuade the English Government of his right to fish under the Scotch monopoly, he boldly went fishing without any patent rights, on the supposition that the profits would probably cover any losses that he might meet with in the shape of fines for disturbing monopoly. He always claimed one-sixth of the fishing, and sent out tonnage to that effect. When Great Britain was at war with the Dutch, Spanish, or French, it was easy to have his ships armed by the state, and then the Yarmouth men could put up a sea-fight against the Greenland Company, and sometimes even went so far as to destroy their shipping and to burn their sheds, a game which they presently found that two could play at. If we remember that the Scotch patent was assigned to one Nathaniel Edwards, and put him into the field with Thomas Horth and the Muscovy Company, we shall find that the history of Greenland whale-fishing for more than a quarter of a century is the history of the disputes and agreements between these three parties, *plus* a small body of fishermen from other harbours on the East Coast. For example, in 1654 the Muscovy Company made a strenuous effort to keep other whale-fishers out of the favoured

localities frequented by the migrating whales; and they made special protest against Thomas Horth, and his claim to one-sixth of the fishing. Horth's reply was to the following effect[1]:—

He had as good a right to Bell Sound, etc., as any, having *fished there twenty-five years*, and being the first man who ever pitched tents at Bottle Cove, and the Rock, in Bell Sound, in 1626, when Captain William Batten and Jno. Mason had the command of his ships, *and has set out* 1/6 *of the tonnage ever since*, except that in this year, 1653 (sc. 1654), his voyage was overthrown by his men being pressed into the services (of the Royal Navy). He has often joined the Company on those terms and helped to keep out the French and the Dutch. Let all the harbours be fished in consort, and those that have the best contribute to the cost of fishing the worst.

In other words, Horth was willing to share an existing monopoly; but by this time, as we shall see, there were other adventurers of a more free character. The same day that Horth's papers were presented to the Council of State, one Edward Whitwell appealed that the Greenland harbours might be kept open to all: that a sufficient number of shallops might be appointed to each harbour; and let the one that came first be first served.

We will return later to this dispute in the winter of 1653-1654. For the present we note that Horth claimed, and no doubt correctly, to have been in the Greenland fishery for a quarter of a century. (This leaves it an open question how far either the ship or himself had before that time been engaged in whaling.) In the year

[1] Calendar of State Papers, 7 February, 1654, p. 392, vol. lxvi., 18 (S.P. Dom.).

1626, we find him taking out letters of marque for his ship "Mayflower"; and it is reasonable to suppose that the ship went to the fishery in the early summer of that year, or in the following year. Perhaps the letters of marque were for the ensuing year, as they make Walter Bullard the Master, and do not speak of Captain Batten. In any case the variation in mastership should be noted.

In the summer of that very year the Scotch patent was granted at Holyrood House to Nathaniel Edwards and his partners to trade and fish in Greenland for twenty-one years, to supply Scotland with oil and Edwards' soap works with raw material.[1] Meanwhile the monopolist right was challenged in another quarter. When the Muscovia Company reached Greenland in 1626 (having set out a fleet of twelve ships for the whole fishing), under Captain W. Goodlad, they found that nine ships, set out by adventurers of York and Hull, had anticipated them, had taken away their shallops and burned their fort. So the Company demanded warrants against the offenders, viz. Richard Prestwood and Richard Perkins.[2] They also put in claims as against certain Dutch whalers, described the discovery of Greenland by their predecessors, and how it had been named (in judicious flattery to which appeal could be made at a later date) after King James.

During the winter of 1626-1627, attempts were made by the Government to remove the differences between the Greenland Company and the Adventurers of York and Hull; who really seem to have had prior rights of occupation; they advise the Muscovites to admit three

[1] Calendar of State Papers, S.P. Dom. (28 July, 1626), p. 386, vol. xxxii., 52.

[2] *Ibid.* (15 Nov., 1626), p. 475, vol. xxxix., 67.

merchants of York and three of Hull under their patent. This was on 9 January, 1627.[1]

Before three months had elapsed the Greenland Company was trying to upset the arrangement; they had heard that Yarmouth and Lynn were wanting to interfere, being no doubt jealous of York and Hull. The reference to Yarmouth and Lynn was probably provoked by Mr. Horth's movements. A little later the Company made further complaints, having heard that certain persons were proposing to operate under Nathaniel Edward's patent. In response to their appeal the persons alluded to were ordered to desist from their preparations and the Company was directed to purchase their plant.[2]

The Company further appealed in more definite terms: they ascertained that one of their own directors, named Nathaniel Wright had joined with Thomas Horth to go whale-fishing under Nathaniel Edwards' patent, and that they were fitting out a ship at Yarmouth for the purpose. They had gone so far as to beguile away the Company's chief harpooner. Petition was accordingly made to the Council of State that all such proceedings be stopped.[3]

The ship referred to was, no doubt, Thomas Horth's "Mayflower". This will come out more clearly if we follow up the dispute. It does not appear that Wright and Horth abandoned their intention of whale-fishing, and they were presently joined by certain free adventurers from Yarmouth and London. On 1 April, 1629, an Order of Council was issued from Whitehall, relating

[1] Calendar for 1627, p. 10, S.P. Dom., vol. xlviii., 1.

[2] *Ibid.* (30 March, 1627), p. 113, S.P. Dom., vol. lviii., 56; and (4 April, 1627), pp. 125, 126, vol. lix.

[3] *Ibid.* (1627 ?), p. 493, vol. lxxxix.

to the whale-fishing for the next season, to the following effect :—

On complaint of the Muscovia Company, against Andrew Hawes, William Batten,[1] and others, of Yarmouth, contrary to an order of the Board, made in April, 1627, it is ordered that Hawes and Batten should enter into bond that the *Salutation* of Yarmouth should not make any voyage for whale-fishery to any countries within the Company's patent; and also that John Mason,[2] Samuel Tolkerne, William Cave,[3] and William Peare, ancient servants of the Company should give bond that they will not make any voyage this year for fishing the whale to any such countries ; and also that Thomas Horth and others are forbidden to set out a ship for any other purpose, under pretence of a patent granted to Nathaniel Edwards in Scotland.[4]

This order does not seem to have produced the desired effect ; for in the spring of next year (1630) the Muscovy Company complained again of Horth and Edwards, and obtained a further Order of Council. The Calendar of State Papers (S.P. Dom.) for 1630 gives us, from vol. 531, the substance of the petition of the Muscovia Company to the Council, showing that in March, 1626, they had appealed against Nathaniel Edwards, Andrew Hawes, one Horth, and others, of Yarmouth, who, under pretence of a void Scottish patent, were then setting forth ships for Greenland. And on 4 April, 1627, it was ordered that they should not proceed, but that the Bailiffs of Yarmouth should stay their

[1] He was captain of one of Horth's ships in 1626.

[2] He also was Captain of one of Horth's ships.

[3] This should be *Cane ;* he appears as the Captain of the "Mayflower" in 1634, *v. infra.*

[4] Calendar, S.P. Dom. (1 April, 1629), p. 511, cxl., 1.

ships. Nevertheless they act in contempt of these orders and those of April, 1629, and they boldly assert that they will do the same this year.

Let Edwards and Horth be sent for to answer their contempts. The Muscovites also complain definitely that Edwards and Horth are fitting out three ships at Yarmouth and London.[1] Horth and Edwards were called before the Council and made to give bond not to set forth any ship to Greenland until they obtained permission from the Board.[2] It is clear that not even this order was deterrent, nor the bond. The ships went to Greenland, and the Scotch contingent were roughly handled by the Company's men, their goods were seized, and they returned empty. This provoked Mr. Edwards to use Scotch influence in high places. The Lord Chancellor of Scotland wrote to the Council of State at Whitehall, informing of complaints made by Nathaniel Uduart (Edwards) and others, his partners, patentees for the Greenland trade of Scotland; their liberties had been violated by the Greenland Company of London, their goods seized, their persons troubled, their ships impeded, so that they have returned empty, which has led to want of oil—and soap! The Lord Chancellor asks that the complainants' losses may be repaired.[3] To this the Company made prompt reply on 9 March.

Addressing Secy. Dorchester with regard to the letter sent him by an honourable person of Scotland, respecting their treatment of Mr. Edwards, they set forth all their proceedings with Horth and others of Yarmouth, Hawes, a cheesemonger of London and Mr. Edwards. They rehearse the various orders of Council

[1] Calendar S.P. Dom., 1630, vol. 540.

[2] *Ibid.* (21 April 1630), p. 240, clxv., 4.

[3] *Ibid.* (19 Feb., 1631), p. 513, vol. clxxxv., 28.

made on the matters in dispute from 1627 to the present time, and conclude that Scotland has no right to complain of violated privilege; it is Edwards who has wronged and molested the Company.[1]

Apparently the dispute was now becoming dangerous; Wright thought it prudent to retire. The Yarmouth ships set sail; and, as we suspected, the "Mayflower" was one of them; for on 29 June, 1631, Wright made an affidavit that before the "Mayflower" and the "Slott"[2] departed out of Yarmouth, he had abandoned all interest therein. So it is clear that the "Mayflower" is Horth's ship and that she is still whale-fishing in Greenland waters. Now let us see how Horth and Edwards will face the situation. Each of them has friends in high places. Horth, to prevent his ships being seized by the bailiffs of Great Yarmouth under an Order of the Council of State, procures a letter from Sir Thomas Gresham to Secy. Dorchester, asking on his behalf that the difference between Horth and the Muscovy Company may receive quick despatch. Horth complains that he had lost £2,000 last year by being stayed when he was ready to go to Greenland.[3]

A month later the Yarmouth bailiffs report that they had stayed the ships alluded to in their order, whereupon Thomas Horth, who is of good estate, had, with Robert Wilton, entered into a bond of £500 not to send certain ships into any parts within the privileges of the Company.[4]

Almost at the same time Nathaniel Edwards

[1] Calendar (9 March, 1631), p. 532, vol. clxxxvi., 63.

[2] Surely a misreading for Skott (the name suggests her nationality and the Scottish patent).

[3] Calendar (12 April, 1631), p. 8, vol. clxxxviii., 47.

[4] *Ibid.* (16 May, 1631), p. 45, vol. cxci., 38.

presents a petition complaining that his ships had been stayed just as they were going to be put to sea. He asks that either the ships may be released, or the Company ordered to supply him with oil.[1]

These appeals brought a few days later a strong order from the Council to the following effect: Wright and Horth were to enter into bonds of £1,000 a piece, that the two ships stayed at Yarmouth (the aforesaid "Mayflower" and "Slott" or "Skott") should not go within the limits of the countries in the patent of the Greenland Company. Upon giving such a bond their ships should be released, and would be allowed to go to Iceland, where they professed to be interested in ling and cod. As to Mr. Edwards, let him break with Horth, get a contract released by which the Greenland Company were sending 100 tons of oil to Scotland, and then come and talk business.[2]

By the autumn when the whalers returned, the Company found that the Yarmouth ships had been to Greenland: so they renewed their petitions to the Council, pointing out that in spite of former orders to Wright and Horth, ships of Thomas Horth had gone to Greenland, and had consorted with strangers as partners and sharers, thereby giving away, as far as it lay in their power, a national interest.[3] Before this appeal was presented, Wright had been sent to the Fleet prison, and arrangements are now on foot to arrest Horth.

From the Fleet, Wright had issued to the Council of State a petition in which he explained that he was a London Merchant and one of the Muscovia Company.

[1] Calendar (18 May? 1631), p. 48, vol. cxci., 59.
[2] *Ibid.* (25 May, 1631), p. 57, vol. cxcii., 37.
[3] *Ibid.* (21 Oct., 1631), p. 168, vol. ccii., 7.

The reason why he had refused to join Horth in a bond that their ship should not go to Greenland, was that he was free of the Company. The Lords had moved him to adventure in the Company's joint stock and to this he had assented. The Company, however, decline to receive him back again. The consequence is that he is excluded this year from any adventure, though he had lived fourteen years in Biscay, where these fishing voyages were first undertaken, and although he was the hirer of those Bisciners by whom English people were taught the skill of killing the whale, and for ten years had been a director and adventurer in the voyage to Greenland. His reward for this is—to be sent to the Fleet![1]

It should be noted in passing that this takes the Greenland Company's fishing back to at least the year 1620, and Mr. Wright's own fishing voyages to an earlier period still.

Now let us return to Horth. At the request of the Muscovy Company he was ordered to appear before Sir Henry Martin, but did not put in an appearance. A warrant was issued for his arrest.[2]

On 25 January he was committed to custody, and his bond sequestrated. He was to be detained till further order. No one not of the Company was to trade with Greenland. The Muscovy people ask that the bond might be assigned to themselves.[3] On 8 February, however, Horth appealed against the decision, and demanded to be heard at law. He had been in custody nearly forty days, and was threatened with a forfeiture of £1,000. He was released on this appeal on his own

[1] Calendar (29 June, 1631), p. 92, vol. cxcv., 19.
[2] *Ibid.* (14 Dec., 1631), p. 201, vol. cciv., 49.
[3] *Ibid.* (25 Jan., 1632), p. 258, vol. ccx., 64.

recognisance of 500 marks to come up when called for.[1]

Meanwhile the forfeiture was assigned by the King, not to the Muscovy Company, but to a lady friend, the widow of Sir Guildford Slingsby; and she was left to get the money at law. But that is not such an easy matter. The Attorney-General deferred the business. The bond was handed in at Court; but it does not seem as if the poor lady ever got the money; as late as 1636 she appears to be petitioning the Lord Treasurer for her rights, says she has spent £500 in getting the forfeited £1,000, and begs for relief. It is doubtful if she ever reached the goal.[2]

Apparently the Yarmouth men resumed whale-fishing in Greenland, which, indeed, they never really suspended. As we shall see presently, the "Mayflower" and a consort went on with what they considered their rights. In 1636 an attempt was made to stay the fishing, and the Yarmouth bailiffs were ordered to arrest the ship "Peter," supposed to be setting forth for Greenland. But the wise bailiffs reported that there was no such ship in the harbour, and that they had failed to find her![3]

Matters went on this way till the Autumn of 1634, when report was made of serious differences between the ships of the Greenland Company and two ships of Yarmouth. The two ships in question were the "Mayflower" and the "James". The "Mayflower" was commanded by William Cane, and the "James" by

[1] Calendar (8 Feb., 1632), p. 267, vol. ccxi., 23.

[2] *Ibid.* (22 Feb., 1632), p. 275, S.P. Dom. vol. ccxi., 69; (23 March, 1632), p. 293, vol. ccxiv., 60; (26 March, 1632), p. 280, vol. ccxii.; (1636 ?), p. 318, vol. ccclxii., 60.

[3] *Ibid.* (28 April, 1633), p. 33, vol. ccxxxvii., 55. The order is in the Great Yarmouth archives.

Thomas Wilkinson; they took possession of a cove ordinarily occupied by the Greenland Company, and fought the Company's ships with shot and shell. Thereupon His Majesty ordered that Horth and the other Yarmouth men who had disobeyed the Board should come up for examination.[1]

Evidently it is Horth's ships that have been at fault; we shall see presently that they had gone back to Nathaniel Edwards and the Scotch patent. The "Mayflower" has now been in the Greenland fishery from 1626 to 1634, apparently with little or no intermission. Her consort now is the "James": that this was one of Thomas Horth's ships appears from the fact that in 1650 she was taken by the Parliament, under contract with Mr. Horth, for a voyage to Barbadoes.[2]

Returning to the fracas with the Muscovites, a petition was presented on 12 January, 1635, by Nathaniel Edwards, William Cane, Robert Seaman, and others employed by Edwards for Greenland. They complain of outrages committed on them and their servants by Captain Goodlad of the Greenland Company. The Northern Kingdom has been outraged in the matter, and demands the right to go peaceably to Greenland in future.[3]

Cane is the Master of the "Mayflower" at this time,

[1] Calendar (9, 12 Oct., 1634), p. 231, vol. cclxxv., 30.

[2] *Ibid.* (15 Nov., 1650), p. 500, vol. xii., 100, and (25 Dec., 1650), report made that the "James," belonging to Mr. Horth, is strong, serviceable and a good sailor. In 1635 the "James," of London, took fifty-three passengers to New England; her master being Wm. Cooper, and her burthen being 300 tons (S.P. Colon. for 12 June, 1635, vol. viii., No. 67). In 1645 the ship "James" of 260 tons was in the fleet for next Summer. Perhaps this is the same ship hired for six months.

[3] Calendar (12 Jan., 1635), p. 461, vol. cclxxxii., 37. Seaman was also a Yarmouth man, and part owner with Horth as well as Captain, of the "Gift" of Yarmouth (S.P. Dom. ccxxix., 36).

as we have seen, and he is now working for Horth, under Edwards. It is a pretty situation for the monopolists to tackle; when monopoly meets monopoly the prospects of the free adventurer begin to brighten.

The fishing of 1636 was conducted under the Scotch patent, an Ipswich ship, named the "Relief," being added by Mr. Horth to the fleet. Fresh difficulties now arose from the fact that Yarmouth, having secured its position as a Scotch town, began to sell oil to the London soap-makers. More exactly it was the Westminster soap-makers, lying outside the group of City "Sopers," who began to deal with the Yarmouth whalers; the London "Sopers" being supplied from the Greenland Company. Competition of this kind was at once denounced, and on 3 March, 1637, the Lords passed an order prohibiting an import of any oil from Greenland except through the Muscovy Company. This looked like checkmate to Mr. Horth, as far as England was concerned, but he stuck to his game. He had contracted to supply the "Sopers" of Westminster with 350 to 400 tons of Greenland oil, and had actually paid the customs duty on the same. He begs at least to be allowed to deliver the 140 tons which came in the "Relief," of Ipswich. One conjectures that the balance of 200 tons came in the "Mayflower," about which ship the less said by Mr. Horth the better,[1] for she was a great sinner. The matter dragged on till the Autumn, when an order of the King in Council proclaimed that as the Muscovy Company have more oils than they can vend in the Kingdom, and as Horth's permission to trade was only for the service of Scotland, he was to sell his oil there or export it. So it had apparently been

[1] Calendar (28 April, 1637), p. 29, vol. cccliv., 102.

conceded that English ships might catch whales for Scotch markets.[1]

Meanwhile, trouble arose in another quarter: for Mr. Edwards and his clan, finding that Horth was seeking for terms of peace with the Greenland Company, suspected him of making preferential terms of settlement for himself, to their detriment. Accordingly, Horth had to make another appeal for an agreement through the Council of State.[2]

Matters now went on as before, Mr. Horth continuing to operate under the Scotch patent, and selling oil to England as he found opportunity. That the "Mayflower" was still in the Scotch fishery as late as 1639 or 1640 appears from a curious case which came up before Archbishop Laud. There was one Richard Colledge, who, with his brother, went to Greenland with the "Mayflower," to fish under the Scotch patent; while they were on shore, boiling oil with the rest of their company, they were attacked by Captain Goodlad of the Muscovy Fleet; and a number of their company, including Richard Colledge's brother, were killed. Upon their return to England, Colledge demanded and obtained the arrest of the murderer, and his appeal was heard before the Archbishop Laud, who promptly released the murderer and sent Colledge to prison! As the political time of day was nearing the advent of Parliamentary Government, Colledge sent his case to the House of Commons; it was referred to Mr. Pym, who in January, 1641, examined some eight or ten witnesses. As, however, the House was busy with the attainder of Strafford, the report on Colledge's case was

[1] Calendar (24 September, 1637), vol. ccclxviii., 25.
[2] *Ibid.* (6 July, 1637), vol. ccclxiii., 44.

obstructed, and remained without a decision until Colledge appealed again to the Parliament in 1643.[1]

The important thing to remember is that in this petition Colledge definitely states that he was employed in the "Mayflower," and that they were operating under the Scotch patent. As we said this brings the "Mayflower," as a Greenland whaler, down to 1639 or 1640.

It now becomes somewhat more difficult to trace the "Mayflower" among the whaling fleet, for on 20 April, 1643, when the Committee for the Navy heard the cause of the merchants of Yarmouth against the Greenland Company, they decided that Thomas Meadows and other merchants of Yarmouth may proceed to the Greenland fishery with their four ships, the "Carnation," the "Hopewell," the "Thomas and William," and the "Swallow"; but they are not to damage the Greenland Company, nor invade their rights as granted and confirmed by Act of Parliament. Here there is no mention of either the "Mayflower" or her owner: we have, however, already given Mr. Horth's statement that he was never out of the fishing except in 1654; but that does not involve the "Mayflower" in an equal persistence of occupation.[2] She may, however, have been still posing as a Scotch ship.

In 1645 the Parliament, in reply to the petitions of the Muscovy Company, decreed that whale-fishing in Greenland waters was free, and proceeded to regulate it by offering to all the ports in England a share in the same, on the understanding that they would combine

[1] Calendar, S.P. Dom., 1643, p. 535, vol. ccccxcix., 47. The account says that the Scotch patent was granted in 1632. Was this a renewal of the patent of 1626?

[2] *Ibid.* (21 April, 1643), p. 457, vol. ccccxcvii, 68.

with the ships of the Greenland Company for mutual defence and assistance. Under this arrangement whale-fishing went on merrily enough; but in a few years time there were so many adventurers that the original company, as well as Mr. Horth and one or two more, took alarm. They proceeded to drive off the latest comers; there were not enough whales to go round. Mr. Horth was now acting with the monopolists, and has become one with them on the ground of prior occupation of the Northern seas; he forgot that if he alleged priority against newcomers, the Company might plead both priority and patent against himself.

Apparently the whale-fishing proceeded as before until in 1649 the Yarmouth whalers were again challenged by the Muscovy Company for illicit operations. The consequence of this complaint was that Thomas Horth (the Calendar of State Papers says Thomas *North*, but it is clearly our old friend) is summoned once more before the Council to answer the complaints of the Greenlanders, and show why he fished in a harbour which had for years been fished only by the Company.[1]

Mr. Horth replied by asking for particulars of the petition. It does not appear that any serious change in the situation was produced.

In the spring of 1652 the Greenland Company made a vigorous effort to recover lost ground. They presented a petition to the Council of State, affirming once more that Greenland was theirs by discovery, and that they had maintained and defended the fishing against all comers. Let Parliament be instructed to stop this illegal fishing and the consequent strife and

[1] Calendar, S.P. Dom. (13 and 17 December, 1649), pp. 435, 437, vol. iii.

bloodshed. Parliament referred the matter to a Committee to decide, on the one hand, the rights claimed by the Company to the sole proprietorship of Greenland whales, and, on the other hand, the claim of the free adventurers to the common rights of Englishmen. Until decision could be reached on these points, fishing was to go on as before, being legalised on the *status quo ante bellum.* As to the dreaded foreigner, an order was made some months later to grant letters of private men of war to the ships of the Muscovy Company.[1] This did not satisfy any of the parties concerned, not even the free adventurers. On 17 January, 1654, Francis Ashe, the Governor of the Muscovy Company, addressed the Protector, pointing out how much the Company was discouraged by the presence of intruders in the fishing grounds. They had lost most of their stock in trade. It was clear that several interests cannot fish in one harbour. Please protect us, and in any case, assign one harbour to one interest.[2] On 31 January, 1654, the free fishers presented their case to Parliament. They objected to the proceedings of the Greenland Company, which had suppressed and imprisoned all not under their flag, had raised the price of oil, and compelled, in consequence, the import of oil from Holland.[3]

Mr. Horth now revived his claim on the Greenland Company for one-sixth of the fishing, and laid before Parliament, in reply to the new adventurers, reasons why people of all sorts ought not to fish in harbours assigned to the Company. As to the Parliament's offer

[1] Calendar, S.P. Dom. 12 March, 1652), p. 177, vol. xxiii., 27; (23 July, 1652), p. 343, vol. xxiv., 3.

[2] *Ibid.* (17 Jan., 1654), p. 362, vol. lxv., 33.

[3] *Ibid.* (21 Jan., 1654), p. 377, vol. lxv., 60.

of free fishing to all English ports, it was clear that there was no demand for it, since in three months from the proclamation, only London, Hull, and Yarmouth had applied for the privilege. The trade was indeed a hazardous one, whose risks outweighed the attractions. He, therefore, proposed that all recent adventurers, of not more than two or three years' standing, should be warned off from the dangerous sport. The original adventurers of London, Hull, and Yarmouth had defended the coast at great cost and loss; but those recent intruders, men like Warner and Whitwell and the rest, had only sent a few small vessels, had done nothing to keep off the Dutch and the French, nay, had even been so unpatriotic as to fraternise with them.

The monopolists met Mr. Horth's proposal for one-sixth of the fishing with a chilling negative; if they conceded such rights to him, how could they refuse it to others? it would unsettle their trade and entangle their accounts; no one would know to which harpoon a particular whale was to be credited. The adventurers equally declined Mr. Horth's proposal to leave them out in the Arctic cold. They were all living under the same government, had common charges, and were entitled to the same liberties. A monopolising patent was inconsistent with the freedom of a Commonwealth. This was the new Cromwellian language. They replied to the arguments of the Company and their fears of loss, pointing out how the Dutch had increased their trade by making it free. They presented proposals for the extension of the fisheries.[1]

In February Mr. Horth came to London and laid before the Council the necessity of furnishing the

[1] Calendar, S.P. Dom. (31 Jan., 1654), p. 379, vol. lxv., 63, 65, 66, 69.

Greenland adventurers generally with a sufficient number of seamen to defend the harbours and protect the ships. It was also suggested that a frigate or warship should be sent to intimidate the foreigner. An estimate was made of the ships necessary to the fishery, and it was proposed to send twelve ships of 3,000 tons and 500 men, the ships to be assigned as follows :—

London : 1,600 tons.
Hull and York : 400 tons.
Yarmouth : 500 tons.
Whitwell and partners : 300 tons.
Battison and partners : 200 tons.

By this disinterested proposal Mr. Horth conceded the demands of the free adventurers, and at the same time reserved his own right to one-sixth of the total tonnage.[1] Apparently he meant to equip two ships of 250 tons each from Yarmouth.

That is the situation on 24 February, 1654,[2] and the matter went forward. Regulations were issued on 1 March for the Greenland fishing and all persons observing them were free to trade; and on 20 March Mr. Horth's further proposals for distributing the ships to the various harbours were received, with a note that the Hull men did not agree to the settlement.[3]

In accordance with these arrangements, which we may call the Horth settlement, the Parliament agreed to liberate the Greenland whalers from the impress

[1] He says positively, S.P. Dom. (7 Feb., 1654), that he had an agreement and settlement with the Company, made by the late King and Lords in 1635, for four years, by which one-sixth part of men and tonnage were allotted him; and that in 1645 Parliament gave him the same privilege for four years.

[2] Calendar, S.P. Dom. (under date), vol. lxvi., 68.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. lxvii., 1; vol. lxviii., 2.

which was operating at all the seaports, and to grant certificates of exemption. On examining these certificates we find that the first is dated 28 March, 1654, and protects 77 harpooners and steersmen and others, useful for killing whales, and is issued at the request of the Muscovy Company, Mr. Horth and Company, Mr. Whitwell and Company, and the new adventurers from Hull. The second is a similar protection to 14 harpooners granted to Richard Batson [Battison] and Company for the voyage to Greenland.[1]

Similar documents were furnished in 1656 to the Muscovy Company who were sending three ships to Greenland, and to Captain Thomas and Company for the Harpooners of the "John of Berkshire" and the "Sarah," and to Captain Whitwell for the "Adventure".[2] Later there is a list of men, furnished by Whitwell, for the ship "Damosell," and a list by James Baker for the "Spinner"[3]. In 1657 a similar protection was issued to the following ships: the "William and Sarah," the "Exchange," the "Mary Bonadventure," the "Spinner," and the "Damosell".[4]

It must not be assumed that the battle for free whales had been finally won. The Horth settlement was for three years, and at the end of that time the monopolists renewed their claim; a Committee of the House of Commons was again set to investigate the matter and reported in favour of the Company, recommending His Highness to encourage the carrying on of the trade by the Company alone, and to forbid others to fish or hinder the Company, especially in Bell Sound

[1] Calendar, S.P. Dom., p. 434, vol. i., 206, 247; vol. i., 19, 22.
[2] *Ibid.* (15 Feb., 1656), p. 183, vol. cxxiv., 65.
[3] *Ibid.* (28 April), p. 298, vol. cxxvi., 116.
[4] *Ibid.* (14 April, 1656), p. 568, vol. i., 77.

and in Horn Sound; and to order the generals of the fleet to protect them and none other, and the Company only to employ English subjects.[1] Later in the year (25 Mar.) some of the merchant adventurers put up opposition to this decision, but it does not seem to have come to anything. It looks as if the monopolists had finally conquered and chased their adversaries off the field. Probably they declared next year a dividend of 300 per cent, and reported that the fishing had been a failure.

CHAPTER V.

MR. MARSDEN'S THEORY OF THE TWO PILGRIM "MAYFLOWERS".

As we have said, much of Mr. Marsden's results is historical matter of the first importance. The determination of the mastership and part ownership of the "Mayflower" by *Christopher* Jones, leads to a number of valuable conclusions and suggestions. This discovery was confirmed by the will of William Mullins, who died on board the "Mayflower" at New Plymouth in 1621. This will, which is preserved at Somerset House (68 Dale, ff. 68, 69), is attested by John Carver, the governor of the Colony, Giles Heale who is thought on good grounds to be the ship's doctor, and Christopher Joanes, who is evidently the Captain of the ship. There need be no further doubt as to the identification. Mr. Marsden, in his search for Christopher Jones' "Mayflower," found various references to the presence of the ship in the Thames: e.g. in 1613 she was twice there, once in July and again in October and November, and export duty was paid on her cargo of stockings,

[1] Calendar, S.P. Dom. (1 Jan., 1658), p. 257.

baize, and rabbit-skins.[1] In 1616 Jones appeared before the Admiralty Court against one Cawkin, who had come on board his ship in the Thames, had abused the master, incited the crew to mutiny, and sampled to his own gratification the cargo of wine on board. From which Mr. Marsden concludes that the ship had been on a voyage to France, Spain, Portugal, or the Canaries. He then observes that the records are silent from 1616 to 1624. At this point we are able to come to his reinforcement with extracts from some of the Port Books at the Record Office, which were not available when Marsden wrote his article.

For example, in the Port Books for the port of London we find as follows :—

K.R. Bundle 24, No. 3 (beginning 9 Dec. 1619).

28 Jan., 1620.

In le "Mayflower" of Lon(don). Christofer Jones M(aste)r

Robert Bell and Co. 11 tonnes french wyne.

In le "Mayflower" pr(ae)d(icto)

Idem Danyell. 8 tonnes redd wyne.

[1] The following appear to be the entries referred to :—

K.R. Customs, 91/8.

23 July, 1613. The "Mayflower" of London. Christofer Jones Master. John Sherrington two packs containing 17 goades cotton, 200 paire short worsted stockings, and single bayes.

24 July, 1613. In the "Mayflower" aforesaid :

Mr. Speight 3 fardles containing 22 goades cottons, 21 pieces double bayes.

In the "Mayflower" aforesaid : 800 goades cottons.

22 Oct., 1613. In le "Maieflower" de London : Christofer Jones Mr. Entry of Coneyskins. The aforesaid "Mayflower". Pieces of single and double bayes.

Similar entries for Oct. and Nov.

In le "Mayflower" of Lon. Christofer Jones Mr.
Hum. Slany. 30 tonnes 1 hogshead fr. wyne.
In le "Mayflower" prd
Thomas Bowley. 11 tonnes 3 hogs^{ds}. fr. wyne.
In le "Mayflower" prd.
John Hall. 11 tons 2 hogs^{ds}. french wyne.
In le "Mayflower" prd.
Thomas Hampson. 18 tons 2 hogs^{ds}. fr. wyne.
In le "Mayflower" prd.
Edward Browne. 21 tonnes 2 hogs^{ds}. fr. wyne.
In le "Mayflower" of London prd.
John Crabbe. 10 tonnes 3 hogs^{ds}. french wyne.
29 Jan. 1620.
In le "Mayflower" prd.
Thomas Fryer. 7 tons 1 hogs^{d}. french wyn.
In le "Mayflower" pred.
Richard Barnabie. 10 tonnes french wynes.
31 Jan. 1620.
In le "Mayflower" pred.
James Sotherne. 5 tons 2 hogs^{ds}. fr. wynes.
In le "Mayflower" of Lon. pred.
Thomas Boothby. 15 tons fr. wynes.

The foregoing entries illustrate Mr. Marsden's statement about the connection of the "Mayflower" with the wine trade, noted by him for the year 1616. It appears as trade with France (probably Bordeaux or Rochelle), and the ship is several times described as the "Mayflower" of London.

Continuing our scrutiny of the same book we find that the ship went back to France for another cargo in the spring of the same year, as the following entries show:—

15 May, 1620.

In le "Mayflower" of Lon. Christofer Jones mr.
Wm. Speight. 50 tonnes fr. wyne.
In le "Mayflower" pred
John Crabbe. 19 tonnes con(yacks)[1] wyne.

19 May, 1620.

In le "Mayflower" pred
John Crabbe. 1 hogs[d]. french wyne.

We are now approaching the time of sailing of the Pilgrims, but alas! entries for June, July, and August are very scarce. There is no sign of the "Mayflower" paying export duties in London. The volume goes on to the end of December, 1620, but, as we should expect, with no further allusion to the "Mayflower," which did not return till 5 May, 1621. Search must now be made for her return and for the entry of her cargo. The matter is complicated by the intrusion of two other "Mayflowers" (one of them described as of London, or from Zante, which traded in currants, the other is apparently in the Irish trade).

In the Port Books for London, K.R. Bundle 24, No. 4, we have as follows :—

20 March, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.
Symon Pitt. 197 cwt. tallow. 17½ ton beefe.

[1] Cognac is, in the first instance, a geographical term, the town of Cognac being a few miles inland from La Rochelle; that cognac, as we know it, was an early product of this region, may be seen from the following :—

"L'industrie de chapeaux (beaver-hats) et de commerce des eaux-de-vie étaient la principale richesse de la Rochelle la Huguenote," Larousse, *Grand Dict. Univ.*, s.v. Castor.

23 March, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

William Awdley. 64½ cwt. tallow.

9 April, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Symon Pitt. 2 ton English beefe.

10 April, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Symon Pitt. 2 ton English beefe (the value was 12 li., and the duty 12s.).

Apparently this is the same ship, under adjacent entries, exporting beef and tallow. We are now nearing the time of the "Mayflower's" return from New England, but I have found no entry of it in the London Port Book. We find, however, the following entries which are interesting: the first is an export of books by John Bill, the Royal Printer :—

17 July, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

John Bill. 2 maunds and ½. unbound books. (val. 10 li. duty 10s.)

In le "Mayflower" prd.

John Gifford. 200 boultes Lyons thread. (val. 20 li. duty 20s.)

whether this is the Pilgrim ship cannot be decided. Then follows later :—

21 August, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" a Madera.

John Crick. 99 cwt. whites. 74 cwt. musk con rosel (?).

2¾ cwt. panner sugar. 635 cwt. woad.

32 cwt. and 90 lbs. of green ginger.

Here again we have no clue to the ship. The next entry appears to be—

21 Sept., 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Peter Gates. 3½ packes Irish yarne, 100 ells Irish lynnen, 1700 lbs candells, 40 raw Irish hides, 39 raw Irish calve skines, 1 barrell and ½ hogshead Irish salmon, 11 cwt. Irish tallow.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Nic. Leat. 75 cwt. pipestands, 20 cwt. headings for pipes, 20 cwt. (hogshead?) stands.

22 Sept., 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Wm. Godfry. 23 cwt. 80 lbs. Scotish yarn: 7 cwt. feathers: 13 doz. goatskins: 1400 lbs p(er) myscitty in y^e^ oyle.

The last entry is evidently of goods brought from the North; Shakespeare's *parmaceti*, which Hotspur informs us is sovran for an inward bruise, is here to hand, and some of the adjacent whale-oil.[1]

From the same quarter (Scotland, Ireland? is it the "Mayflower" of Londonderry?) come the following entries :—

26 Sept., 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Gifford.[2] 1¾ pack of Irish yarne.
2 cwt. Irish woole.
2¾ cwt. tallow.

[1] Evidently there has been whale-fishing somewhere, but it need not have been in Greenland; perhaps a whale had wandered to the Irish coast.

[2] Apparently this is the same person mentioned above under 17 July, 1621; and we have two voyages of the ship in the Summer

28 Sept., 1621.

In the "Mayflower" prd.

William Killmany. Scot. 44¾ cwt. proynes.

30 Sept., 1621.

In the "Mayflower" prd.

John Duffe mr. 100 (?) tonn oaken timber.

All of these entries belong to the same ship. Then at last we come upon our Pilgrim ship again.

19 Oct., 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd. Christofer Jones mr.

60 way bay salt.

Apparently there should be some previous entry but we have not found it; nor is there any sign of the provenience or destination of the salt. As it is known as bay-salt it is probably an import from the French coast north of Bordeaux (the Bay *par excellence*).[1]

of that year, or one export entry and one later import. This cannot be the whaling-ship: one does not send unbound books to the North Pole! Moreover, her master appears to be a Scot named Duff.

[1] The *Oxford Dictionary* gives us a choice between salt from the Bay of Biscay and salt from Bayonne: as the following references will show:—

1465. Mann. and Household Exp. 201.
Item for di(midium) a bz of baye salt ii. d. ob.

1559. *Wills and Invent.* N.C. (1835)184.
In the Salt Garner.
Halffe a waye of baye salt.

1612. Woodall. *Surg. Mat.* (1653).
207. Bay or Sea Salt, dried merely from salt sea water, by the heat of the Sunne.

1633. C. Butler. *Engl. Grammar.* Index.
Bai Salt, salt of Bayonne in France.

[*Continued on next page.*

A few days later we are definitely told that the salt came from Rochelle. The following is the entry:

xxxi die Octobris 1621.

. . . . . .

In le Maieflower Xpofer Jones M^r^. â Rochell.
Idem M^r^. xlii waie et di (midium) baye salt:

(value)	(duty)
xlii li. xs.	xlii s. vi d.

The next "Mayflower" to turn up is the ship that brings currants from Zante.

21 November, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" de London, John Goodlad, Mr. Zante.
John Wild. 7½ cwt. currants in 31 butts, and 4 cartells. (Subject to new impost.)
In le "Mayflower" prd.
Thomas Vaughan. 14 cwt. currants.

An attempt was made to produce bay salt in Virginia in 1628 (see *S.P. Colonial*, p. 90).

A similar proposal was made for the new Colony of Carolina, (*S.P. Colonial*, p. 120, under date 24 September, 1630), and it is said "if the saltmen cannot be had from Plymouth, they *must send at great expense to Rochelle for them*". Bay salt is salt from Rochelle.

The allusion above to the possibility of obtaining salt-workers from (New) Plymouth brings to the front the attempts made by the Pilgrims to make salt on their own account for the local fisheries. The first trial was in 1624, when the Adventurers, who had not yet lost heart over the Pilgrims, sent out in the ship "Charity" a shipwright and a saltmaker. It was not a success as far as the salt-industry was concerned. The man was not an expert. He made too hot a fire, burned down the house where he was working, and ruined his salt-pans. The incident will explain why the Carolina people were looking to Plymouth for salt.

29 November, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

A succession of entries of discharged goods; cotton-wool, goat's hair, cotton yarne, gum arabic and currants.

1 December, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" de Zante.

Thomas and Daniel Harvey. 14¼ cwt. currants.

5 December, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

George Oakland 4 p(ackage)s in all Reisons (here we have Falstaff's pronunciation, 'were *reisons* as plenty as blackberries, I would give no man a *reason* upon compulsion').

13 December, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd. 30 cwt. of hoppes.

16 December, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd. John Goodlad Mr.

58½ cwt. of currants.

18 December, 1621.

In le "Mayflower" prd.

Wm. Atkins—yards of Turkey grograine.

In le "Mayflower" prd. John Goodlad, Mr.

1930 lbs of cotton yarn.

In the "Mayflower" a Zant. John Goodlad Mr.

John Wyld. 12 cwt. currants.

All these entries appear to refer to the same ship, engaged in the Levant trade, with headquarters at Zante.

The foregoing entries may, at first sight, appear somewhat meaningless; in reality they are very instructive. We find our "Mayflower" engaged in the

Bordeaux trade all through the winter of 1619-1620, and even into the early summer. When she comes back in 1621, the first trace we find of her shows that she has been to the Bay of Biscay for salt. The meaning of this is clear; she has a regular Biscayan trade; she goes backwards and forwards for wines, cognac, and salt. Now a little reflection will show that such a trade was exactly the supplement of the whaling ventures to Greenland. In the first place when the short summer season for Greenland fishing was over, a good part of the year was still available for trading elsewhere. The winter and spring voyages would naturally be to the South: but why to the Bay of Biscay in particular? The answer is that the *early whalers were recruited from the Biscayan sailors*,[1] who actually taught the English the use of the harpoon. We have seen above that when Mr. Wright was sent to the Fleet prison in

[1] When the Muscovy Company petitioned the Protector on 17 January, 1654, on behalf of the Monopoly, they point out that whale-fins (i.e. what we call whale-bone) and oil were formerly brought from Biscay (S.P. Dom., lxv., 33).

The Biscayans learnt their craft in its first stages by operating upon whales in the Bay of Biscay itself; for the map tells us that the Northern extremity of the Isle of Rhé is called *Pte des Baleines*.

The Basque whale is still occasionally found and is a smaller variety than the Greenland whale. It was commonly hunted in the Middle Ages in the Bay of Biscay with harpoons and lances. The time of arrival in the Bay was in the winter months (Jan., Feb.). Many Biscayan towns show traces of the whales in their coat of arms: e.g. the seal of Fontarabia of the thirteenth century, now in the Louvre, shows a whale struck by two harpoons, which have been launched by four men in a boat.

Ruins of the look-out towers of the Biscayan whalers may still be seen along the coasts. It was, then, perfectly natural that the Basque fishermen should have been among the first to exploit the marine wealth of the Polar regions.

1631 at the instance of the Muscovy Company, of which he had been at one time a member, he presented a petition to the Council of State, explaining that he had lived fourteen years in Biscay, and had hired the Biscayans who had taught the English the use of the harpoon, and had actually been for ten years a member of the Greenland Corporation. It appears from this statement that the Biskiners, as they were called, were the back-bone of the whaling-fleet as far back as 1621, and probably for some years earlier. They were the expert harpooners. It follows naturally enough that when the whaling season is over in any year, these Biscay men have to be returned to their homes for the winter, and this return dictates the direction of the winter trade. At first sight it seemed as if, when we proved the "Mayflower" to be in the wine and salt trade, we had proved that she was not a whaling ship; but upon a more exact view of the trading situation, we see that the two lines of trade were supplementary. We may almost take it for granted that Christofer Jones' ship was a whaler, when we have proved her to be a Biscayan, and when we know that her seamen were expert whale-fishers.

In 1621 the "Mayflower" reached home on 5 May, and apparently was not in time to refit and join the whaling fleet. That is why she runs down to the Bay for a cargo of salt, instead of taking the normal voyage to the Arctic circle. She lost her Greenland voyage that year, as she had lost it in 1620 by taking the Pilgrims to New England. We need not have any serious doubt that whale-fishing would be continued by the owners of the ship; but Mr. Marsden has shown that Christofer Jones died in 1622, and that some re-arrangement of ownership went on in 1624. But this brings

us almost into touch with the Greenland whaler of Thomas Horth, the "Mayflower" of Yarmouth, which we have proved to be in the Northern fishery from 1626 to 1639, and perhaps both earlier and later.

It will, perhaps, be asked whether, if Mr. Hort takes over Christofer Jones' ship, he also takes over the Biscay trade and employed Biskiners as harpooners. Here is an instance which looks like it. In January, 1632, Mr. Horth gets into trouble with Spain; he has been trading South with the ship "Katharine" of Aldborough (an adjacent port to Yarmouth), and on his return voyage he secured a cargo of Bay salt which turned out to be the property of His Majesty of Spain. We notice that he was doing the same kind of trade that Christofer Jones had done some ten years earlier.[1]

We can make the connection between Mr. Horth and the Biscay trade a little closer. The reason why the Yarmouth ships fetched Bay salt was that the salt was needed for the Yarmouth herring fishery; Mr. Horth was in the salt trade, first as importer, for the production of bloaters, and then when salt became a home industry, as a leading Salter of the Worshipful Company of Salters. He settled the duty with the Government and the price with the consumer and home producer. Here are some of the incidental proofs of our statements as to his control of the home and foreign salt trade. In 1636 the Salters of North and South Shields agreed with *Thomas Horth and others of the Society of Salters* for a certain duty and a fixed price for salt. And they appealed to the Council of State that certain of their own number who had objected to the price list might be ordered to agree with the prices *as fixed by Mr. Horth.*[2]

[1] S.P. Dom. (28 Jan., 1632), vol. xcx., No. 76.

[2] *Ibid.* (1636), vol. cccxli., No. 126.

In 1637 the import of foreign salt had been affected by the home monopoly, and the supply of salt was short. So the Yarmouth fishery begged for leave to import foreign salt; they maintained that their herrings and other fish could not well be preserved in the heat of summer without *Spanish or Bay salt* to mingle with the white. They presented a certificate from the Salters of Shields approving of the import of 300 weigh of foreign salt. An order was accordingly issued permitting of the import of so much salt *by Mr. Thomas Horth*, who was to pay his Majesty's ancient customs and all other duties.[1]

This appears to have affected the salt market elsewhere, and in the course of the next year petitions were presented from all the Southern and some Eastern seaports with regard to the prices for fish-salt charged by the Salters of Shields. The business was suffering from monopoly. Mr. Horth explained matters to the Council, and he was advised to make an agreement with certain fishermen as to the price at which salt was to be sold.[2]

We may now look upon him as a salt king, and there is evidence that he used his power as monopolists are apt to do; complaints are made of him from time to time, but as he could give the King a bond for £2,000 to collect the duties for him, he could hold his own against the lesser fry of producers and purchasers. We have proved, then, that Mr. Horth is a leading salt importer.

We can also show in an indirect way the probability that he was engaged in other commercial ventures with the same ship, in the intervals between the whaling voyages.

[1] S.P. Dom. (1637), vol. cccIvii., No. 117.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. cccciv., No. 101.

THE LAST OF THE "MAYFLOWER".

There has recently come into the possession of the John Rylands Library a certificate of the discharge of a quantity of coal at Boston in Lincolnshire from the "Mayflower" of Yarmouth. The document is so interesting from the point of view of the "Mayflower" explorers that we transcribe it in full :—

Boston.

Knowe yee y^{t} Robert Jarie hath delivered at this port twentye seauen Chaldr of Coles out of the "Mayeflower" of Yarmouth himselfe m(aste)r from Newcastle per certificatt dated the second daye of this present month wittnes our seales of office dated this XIIIth day of Septem anno reg Caroli nostri secundo 1626.

Will Bonner per Coll. And. Baron. Compt. et pro ferma.

Here we have a "Mayflower" of Yarmouth carrying coals as a coasting vessel in the autumn of 1626. Her master is said to be one Jary, a well-known Norfolk name. It is curious that William Batten does not appear nor Walter Bullard. Perhaps the explanation is that captains, when not owners, were engaged for single voyages. It would be easy to show that Mr. Horth, who may be at the back of this bit of coal-trading, was certainly at a later date involved in the Newcastle coal trade on a great scale. Further investigation may be necessary on this point.[1] At all events, here is one more important "Mayflower" document recovered from the past. If the ship is Mr. Horth's it is the same as his whaling vessel, and may, therefore be the original Pilgrim ship. If she is not Mr. Horth's, we have two Yarmouth

[1] This "Mayflower" may perhaps be only a collier, for we can easily find Mayflowers in the coal-trade plying between Newcastle and Sunderland and East Coast towns.

"Mayflowers," of which one may very well be the Salem ship of 1630, and the Pilgrim ship of 1620.

Mr. Marsden does not think the ship of 1620 and the ship of 1630 are the same; but he allows there is evidence to show that the "Mayflower" of 1630 was of Yarmouth, owned in and after 1627 by Thomas Horth of Yarmouth, and that she became a whaler. He appears to be too much under the influence of the idea that the Pilgrim ship was a poor unseaworthy creature, on her beam-ends almost from the start, and that the rich Massachusetts Company would never have engaged such a broken-down ship: this opinion is largely due to the interpretation which he puts upon the appraisement of the ship after Christofer Jones' death. We have suggested that there is another possible explanation of that appraisement. As to the general fitness of the ship for Atlantic sailings, we have the evidence of her own seamen that they knew her to be sound below the waterline and her rapid passage home in 1621. We think that Mr. Marsden has made a mistaken judgment of the good ship.

We have, then, to determine the relations of three ships to one another:—

A. The historic "Mayflower" of 1620.

B. The whaler of Mr. Horth, 1626-1640 (?)

C. The Pilgrim-Puritan ship of 1629-1630.

Of A we know now a good deal; in 1609, 1610, 1611, and 1612 she was in the possession (wholly or in part) of Christofer Jones, and is, like himself, referred to Harwich. She was in the Biscay trade in 1615, 1616, and 1617, and in all probability in the Greenland whale-fishery. She is called the "Mayflower" of London in the Port Rolls. She was, in fact, trading with Bordeaux and Rochelle right up to the time of

the sailing with the Pilgrims, and went back to the Bay of Biscay as soon as she returned.

Of B we have a pretty complete record; she is the "Mayflower" of Yarmouth, and engaged in the Greenland fishery almost continuously from 1626-1640. Her owner, Mr. Horth, has, for part of that time, the association with himself of Mr. Nathaniel Wright, a London merchant, for many years resident in Bordeaux, and a pioneer, with Biscayan aid, of the Greenland whale-fishery. Mr. Horth, as we have seen, had also Biscayan ventures, and traded in Bay salt.

Of C we know that she is a Yarmouth ship, being so described in a letter of the Massachusetts Company to Governor Endicott. This comes out also in Higginson's *Journal*, who says definitely, in describing the Fleet that took the Puritans to Salem in 1630, that *she was of Yarmouth.* She was either hired or owned at the time of the voyage by Mr. Goffe, one of the original Pilgrim Adventurers. It seems to us that A, B, and C must be the same ship. A and B are closely connected by their being whalers; and by the contiguity of their ports of reference (for Harwich goes readily enough with Yarmouth in the whaling industry[1]).

We must assume that the "Mayflower" (A) missed her whale-fishery in 1620 and perhaps in consequence in 1621. B and C are also closely connected by their port of reference, unless we like to say that we have lighted on two different "Mayflowers" of the very same

[1] Her original Port of Registry would naturally be changed after Christofer Jones' death, if she came into Mr. Horth's hands. Mr. Marsden shows that a new "Mayflower" was built at Aldborough in 1625 by two of the former owners, and says that the fact that Childe and Moore named their new ship "Mayflower" makes it unlikely that their old "Mayflower" (Christofer Jones' "Mayflower") was still afloat *or owned by them;* we note the alternative.

port; if we do not make that assumption we shall have to allow that the "Mayflower" (C) missed her whaling voyage in 1630. This may very well have been due, in the first instance, to the machinations of the Greenland Company, which obtained orders in 1629 and 1630 against the sailing of the Yarmouth ships. We have seen that the "Mayflower" was in the fishery in 1631, and it is a natural suggestion that she was taken off in 1629 (and perhaps some Scotch ship or from some northern port substituted). In that case, she would have been lent to Mr. Goffe, who despatched to Boston and Salem, in the fleet that left Southampton, the two ships, the "Mayflower" and the "Whale," both of which would, in that case, be whaling ships taken off their service, as indeed the name of the second ship suggests.

A conjecture will perhaps elucidate the whole affair of these ships. We have seen that Mr. Goffe is one of the original adventurers who organised the Pilgrim migration (and becomes later a member of the New England Corporation).

The list of these adventurers has been reconstructed partly from Governor Bradford's *Letter Book*, and partly from special research; in this list we find that amongst those who sign a composition with the Pilgrims in 1626, there is the name of one Thomas Heath; Azel Ames says of him that he "does not appear to have been active and nought is known of him". Read for Thomas Heath, Thomas Horth, and he will become at once both active and renowned. The mistake is quite easy in decipherment or transcription of an unusual name in the documents of the time.[1] This would make Mr. Horth

[1] See Bradford's *Letter Book*. Massachusetts *Historical Collections*, 1st series, vol. iii., p. 48. We have already two cases where the transcribers have turned the perplexing name into North.

one of the original adventurers, would explain his interest in the "Mayflower" on the one hand, as the ship in which he had taken a plantation venture, and on the other, as a whaler suitable to be employed later in his Greenland speculations; it would also explain how Mr. Goffe, his colleague in the original venture, and like himself an earnest Puritan, got possession of two whaling ships for the fleet of 1629-1630. The restoration of Mr. Horth's name makes the whole thing clear; the three ships are the same. Mr. Horth must have got control of the ship after the death of Christofer Jones. As one of the original adventurers to New England, and the patron of the East coast whalers, he would have known all about the ship and its owners.

The connection of our ship C with Yarmouth and with the whaling fleet of Mr. Horth comes out in another way; her master on the voyage to Salem was William Pierce, who had also conveyed some of the Pilgrims in the ship "Ann" at an earlier date. That Pierce was a whaler comes out in the petition of the Muscovia Company against Horth and the Yarmouth whalers. Special restraints are laid on William Batten (who had commanded the "Mayflower" for Horth in Greenland in 1626), on John Mason (who had also commanded another ship of Horth's at the same date), on William Cane (who became Captain of the "Mayflower" on her voyage to Greenland in 1634), and on William Pears,[1] who is described as an ancient servant of the Company and is implied to be now at Mr. Horth's call. This injunction against going to Greenland was issued in 1629, and its effect on William Pears appears

[1] The printed Calendar of State Papers says "Peare," but this is probably a mistake in transcription.

to have been that it liberated him to take Mr Horth's ship to New England. He is Horth's man commanding Horth's ship. Moreover he is a Yarmouth man, and his birth is entered in the Yarmouth Church register under date 1 November, 1582, Wyllyam Perce, sonne of John and Alyce. It is interesting to see how closely the whale-fishers of the East coast of England are involved in the expeditions to New England, and in its first settlement.

Supposing this to be a correct interpretation, and that the "Mayflower" of 1630 is also a whaler of the Yarmouth fleet, we naturally ask what became of her on her return from Salem. Does she also go to the Bay of Biscay for trade, as the "Mayflower" of 1620 did? The answer appears to be in the affirmative. On January 22, 1631, we find a "Mayflower" of Yarmouth, discharging from Bordeaux a cargo of French wine at Hull. The total amount of wine discharged is about 206 tuns. She is, however, under the care of another Master, one William Trasey, who appears to have been part owner of the cargo. We give the whole of the entries in a footnote. The amount of wine carried by the "Mayflower" of 1620 on her first voyage in 1620 appears to have been about 160 tuns. Thus the two ships, the "Mayflower" of 1620 and the "Mayflower" of 1631 have the same name, the same trade with the same foreign port, the same port of registry, and approximately the same burden. The only difference is that William Trasey has replaced William Pears; the two ships appear to be the same.[1]

[1] The entries in the Hull Port Books are as follows, omitting the amounts paid for import duties:—

Jan. 22, 1631. In the Maieflower of Yarmouth,
William Tracey Mr. from Burdeaux

Matthew Tophlin ix tonnes of
Gabriel Rudd in ead. vi tonnes of
Henry Thompson in ead. xix tonnes of } vini Francie

Willm Mathew in the Maieflower. ii tonnes iii h[ogsh] of
Christopher Tophlin iii tonnes ii h[ogsh] of } vini Francie

Josua Rakes in the Maieflower. iiij tonnes i h[ogsh] of
John Maihou in the Maieflower xxxviii tons } vini Francie

Jan. 23, 1631. Joh. Swann in the Maieflower. iii tonnes of
Peregrine Pelham in the Maieflower. xxii tones ii h[ogshead] and ii tearces } vini Francie

More for him in ead. vij h[ogsh] of vinegar

Alexander Swann in the Mayflower. vii tonnes i h[ogsh] of
Nicholas Denman in the Mayflower v tonnes iii h[ogsh] of } vini Francie

Roger Jaques in y^e^ Maieflower. iii tons vinegar

Willm Danher in ead. xxx reames of white pap[er]

Richard Rakes in the Mayflower. xi tons of vini Francie

Jan. 25. Matthew Dawson in y^e^ Maieflower. xi tonnes and two tearces of
Richard Clarke in y^e^ Maieflower. iiij tonnes of
Francis Dewicke in ead. v tonnes of
Willm Lindlay in ead. vii tonnes of } vini Francie

Christofer Breaney in y^e^ Maieflower. x tonnes
William Trasey in eadem v tonnes } vini Francie

More for him in ead. vi hogshead of vinegar.

William Trasey in y^e^ Maieflower. iiij tonnes and iii hogsheads of
Henrie Sympson in y^e^ Maieflower. iii tonnes and one hogsheade of } vini Francie

Feb. 3. William Blagg in y^e^ Maieflower. ii tonnes of vini Francie

This appears to complete the discharge of the cargo.

There is another minor reason why Mr. Horth, the Puritan merchant of Great Yarmouth, should have been interested in the Leyden migration. Yarmouth had furnished a strong contingent to the Church in Leyden, under John Robinson's care, and so had Ipswich and Colchester. This has not been commonly nor sufficiently recognised ; one way to see it is to examine the Dutch records and find out who were finally left behind of the English Colony. If we find Yarmouth men there, we may infer from the fact of their occurrence in the remnant that some such were also probably to be found amongst those who sailed in the four Pilgrim migrations (the "Mayflower," the "Fortune," the "Anne," and again the "Mayflower").

The evidence is given by Arber, *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, pp. 273 ff., from H. C. Murphy's account in the *Historical Magazine* (vol. iii., p. 358). In the list of names there collected we find—

William Buckram, from Ipswich, block-maker.
Samuel Butler, from Yarmouth, merchant.
Roger Chandler, from Colchester, silk-worker.
Daniel Fairfield, from Colchester, silk-worker.
John Jennings, from Colchester, fustian-worker.
Joseph Parsons, from Colchester, silk-worker.
Henry Wilson, from Yarmouth, pump-maker.

Here then are two emigrants from Yarmouth, one from Ipswich, and four from Colchester. It is evident that the Pilgrim leaven had been working in East Anglia. This result has already been arrived at for the Leyden Pilgrims by Dr. Dexter and his son. They calculated the English sources of the Pilgrim migration for the various counties involved ; the statistic is very curious in its distribution. Norfolk has the first place with 32

emigrants; Kent (Sandwich),[1] and London are next with 17 Pilgrims each. In this identification the term Norfolk means practically Norwich and Yarmouth.

Our case, that Mr. Horth must have been acquainted with the local migrations from East Anglia, would be strengthened if it could be maintained that Robinson himself had been, for a time, engaged in the ministry of the Word at Mundham, near Yarmouth; but this is probably another Robinson, and not to be confounded with John, the illustrious. Even if Mundham turns out, as we believe it does, to be a false scent, it is not so far off to Norwich, where Robinson certainly discharged an earlier part of his apostolate, and experienced the apostle's rejection. In any case it is clear that the counties of East Anglia had their share in the movement of Pilgrims, as well as the counties of York, Lincoln and Nottingham. It is highly improbable that Mr. Horth was unaware of what was going on, or that he was unsympathetic with it. He may very well have been predisposed to taking a share as an adventurer in the colonisation of North Virginia by his acquaintance with what was taking place in the colonisation of—Holland!

We suspect that there is a further reason why Mr. Horth was interested in the Pilgrims and their historic ship. The name which he bears is not East Anglian; it belongs to Lancashire and Yorkshire, in whose dialect it simply means High Village. Now we want to draw attention to the following singular fact, that among the Leyden group there was a certain John Horth, who died in Leyden in or before 1617; the

[1] The importance of Sandwich might have been suspected from its occurrence as a New England town on the bay of Cape Cod. A similar observation can be made for Yarmouth.

record of the second marriage of his widow is preserved in the Leyden archives, and noted by Dexter in his appendix to *England and Holland of the Pilgrims* as follows :—[1]

> Collet, *Henry*. Twine-maker . . . betrothed to Alice Howarth, 19 May, 1617, with witnesses, John Crackstone, Thomas Harris, and Isabel Chandler. Married on 3 June. Lived on *Korte Heerensteeg*.
>
> Collet, *Alice* (Thomas, Howarth) widow of John ; second wife of Henry Collet.

It appears from the foregoing that Mr. Horth had a relative in the Leyden Company ; probably it was an elder brother. It is not easy to dissociate the two ; if they are related the one to the other, the reason for Mr. Horth's interest in the "Mayflower" adventure would have a sufficient explanation. He was following his brother's lead at a long distance, being in fact a Puritan but not a Pilgrim.

I have made some search into the origin of the Horth family at Yarmouth. Thomas Horth's birth is not in the Church register, nor have I found the entry of his marriage, but I find record of the birth of three children ; and in the Yarmouth town archives there is account of his admission after apprenticeship to the burgess roll, the common council and the aldermanship ; of this more elsewhere.

All we affirm at this point is the possibility outlined above that Mr. Horth had a very near relation among the first Leyden settlers.

We have now seen how important Mr. Marsden's investigations are, and to what results they lead us,

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 610. But the MS. does not say Howarth ; it is Houth, to judge by a photograph ; Howarth is Dexter's conjecture.

when we add the supplementary data from the Customs Books of the Port of London and elsewhere.

Dr. Azel Ames in an appendix to his valuable work *The "Mayflower" and her Log*, gave a short notice of Mr. Marsden's work which he failed to appreciate. He declines to surrender Thomas Jones' place as Captain of the "Mayflower" to Christopher Jones; in this he is surely wrong; but he also maintains resolutely the identity of the two "Mayflowers" of 1620 and 1630, and in this he appears to be right. He says that "the coincidence of a 'Christopher Joanes' at an irrelevant time, in command of an obviously different 'Mayflower,' and the presence of a man of that name as one of the crew of the Pilgrim ship (the name of both ship and man being concededly common), goes very little way to overthrow the close-linked logic of numerous well-known facts, and the well-matured opinion of the ablest historical researchers—like Neal and Goodwin—based thereon, which have established *Thomas* Jones as Master of the Pilgrim craft". I suppose that irrelevancy of time, to which Dr. Ames referred, has disappeared, in consequence of our researches, and it is also fair to say that while Jones is a concededly common name, and so is Thomas Jones, the combination Christopher Jones is anything but common. Dr. Ames' objections to Christopher Jones are no longer valid. He was certainly not "one of the crew" of the "Mayflower".

In the course of the inquiry a difficulty which Mr. Marsden felt as to the absence of traces of the whaling-fleet in the London Port Books has disappeared. Mr. Horth traded his whale-oil to Scotland, for the most part, or to Holland, for which reason it does not appear in the London Customs Returns. The evidence that the

"Mayflower" was a whaling-ship appears to be cumulative and convincing.

A Note on the "Mayflower" of Zante.

We came across another "Mayflower" of London, described alternatively as the "Mayflower" from Zante, in the course of our inquiries. A few lines may suffice to show that she is not a counter-claimant for a place of honour in the historical tradition. We found her importing currants, and other Levantine produce in November, 1621, under Captain John Goodlad.

John Goodlad is some relation of William Goodlad, who is the chief Captain of the fleet of the Greenland Company's whalers. He does not remain in the Levant trade, for in April, 1634, we find the ship under a new Master, one William Baddiley, who is suspected by the Government of having evaded the payment of customs.[1] Three years later the ship was impressed for the Royal Navy, and we find the following instructive entries :—

18 March, 1637. Among the ships lying in the Thames is the "Mayflower," William Baddilow, Master, then in Mr. Greaves' dock and to be ready next spring. She is of 350 tons, carries 24 guns, and 140 men.[2]

On 3 May, an order is issued to supply the ship with 28 barrels of gunpowder, under care of Captain William Beddiloe, in his Majesty's service.[3]

Four other ships were imprest at the same time, to wit, the "Unicorn," the "Pleiades," the "Industry,"

[1] S.P. Dom. (2, 17 April, 1634).

[2] S.P. Dom., under date, vol. cccl., No. 30. On 21 March, the Trinity House report the burthen of the ship to be 346 tons, and that she carries 145 men, which agrees closely with the previous estimate.

[3] *Ibid.* (3 May, 1637), vol. ccclv., No. 60.

and the "Richard and Mary," and it was directed that they should be measured according to the length of their keels; their breadth from outside to outside of the plank; their depth from a perpendicular line from the extreme breadth to the bottom of the keel, with the product divided by various constant numbers (100 in Master Burrell's time, 94 according to the usage of the shipwright, etc.) The result for the "Mayflower" came out as follows:—

Length of keel 79 feet.
Breadth 31 feet.
Depth 15 feet.

Divide by 94: tonnage 390 75/94: corresponding to an allowance of 165 men.

Divide by 100: tonnage 367 35/100: 146 men.

Divide by 100 according to King's rule of 1628: tonnage 323 46/100: 128 men.

The details are interesting as showing (1) the way in which the estimate of tonnage varied; (2) the impossibility of identifying the ship with the old "Mayflower" of 180 tons.[1] The ship was engaged for six months' service, and on 22 September of the same year we find Sir John Pennington writing from the Downs to the Admiralty to say that he has discharged the two ships, the "Mayflower" and the "Pleiades".[2]

CHAPTER VI.

MR. WEBBER'S "MAYFLOWER".

WE must now try and find out some more about the Boston "Mayflower," owned by Mr. Thomas Webber, which we found carrying goods to New England for

[1] S.P. Dom. (22 March, 1637), vol. cccl., No. 65.

[2] *Ibid.*, under date, vol. ccclxviii., No. 11.

John Eliot in 1653, and which we have shown to have been at anchor in Boston Harbour in October, 1652, waiting to sail for London via Barbadoes.

Here are some more documents relating to the voyage in 1653.

On 27 August, 1653, there was presented to the Council of State a petition from Thomas Webber, of the "Mayflower," belonging to Boston in New England, for a protection for 20 seamen (against impress), and for letters of marque that he may be the better able to serve the State and the plantation. He was bound for New England, but had been detained by weighty affairs, and had been unable to get seamen; winter was drawing on; the plantation required the speedy assistance of his ship against the Dutch; accordingly an early reply to the petition is asked for.[1]

On 12 September, 1653, an order of the Council of State was issued for letters of marque against the Dutch only, for the "Bonadventure" of 100 tons and 14 guns; the "Mayflower" of 160 tons and 18 guns; and the "Hope" of 120 tons and 8 guns, all bound for Virginia.[2]

This is clearly our Boston ship, for which Mr. Webber had asked for letters of marque; we notice that the tonnage is somewhat under the estimate of Mr. Thomas Webber, and that the destination is said to be Virginia and not New England. It is possible that Virginia was still the official title for the Western settlements.

Perhaps the matter will become clearer and our identification of the two "Mayflowers" just mentioned more certain, if we now go back a couple of years. On

[1] S.P. Dom. (27 Aug., 1653), vol. xxxix., 80.

[2] *Ibid.*, Interregnum., vol. i., 70, pp. 364-5.

28 May, 1651, we find that an order was issued by the Council of State, upon petition of Abraham Palaer and Thomas Webber, granting them liberty to trade to Virginia, upon giving security that they will not trade with the enemies of the State in that Colony, nor give assistance to them. Also letters of marque to enable them to do the Commonwealth service.[1]

Now this is clearly our Thomas Webber, apparently bound for Virginia, which is a disloyal Colony; he has evidently presented a petition similar to that in 1653, asking for letters of marque that he may better serve the State and the plantation. Such letters were usually inscribed "for this voyage only". The document as issued says, "to do the Commonwealth service," because the plantation is a part of the Commonwealth. So his ship is given the required papers, no doubt against the Dutch; and that it was the very same "Mayflower" and that she was going to Boston, appears from a note in Colonel Popham's diary, who relates that on 20 June, 1651, when he was in the Downs with the fleet, the "Mayflower" arrived from the Thames on her way to New England.[2] Clearly it is the Webber ship, whether she ever got to Virginia on her trading voyage or not. We have now taken the Boston "Mayflower" back two years before the Eliot bill of lading. She must have passed wholly or in part into Thomas Webber's hands, not later than the spring of 1651. The reason for the special permission to trade to Virginia is probably to be sought and found in the relations between the Commonwealth and the Colony. Virginia had been put "out of bounds" for disloyalty, and by an Act of Parliament of 19 September, 1650, all trade was prohibited. This

[1] S.P. Dom., Interregnum, vol. i., 19, p. 107.

[2] See the Leybourn-Popham MSS. in Hist. MSS. Comm., p. 91.

explains why we find special permits of trade in the time just before and just after the passing of the Act. The "Mayflower" could not do coast trade from Boston to Barbadoes, for instance, without such a permit.

In taking Mr. Webber back to 1651, we made the discovery, and it is an important one, that he was only part owner at this time. He has a colleague named Abraham Palaer. The name is peculiar, certainly not English. It is either a French name (Palayer) or a Spanish name (Palayo). If French, it is from the south-west of France, if Spanish, it is from the north-east of Spain, the two possibilities being covered by the term Biscayan. I have not succeeded in finding the name extant in Bayonne, Bordeaux, La Rochelle, or Nantes, though it may very well be there; on the other hand, I have found almost equivalent forms in Saragossa, Bilbao, and Santander. We remember Don Pelayo, the first of the Spanish champions of Christendom against the Moors, who occupies the leading position in Spanish romance.

If this is the right explanation of the name we are obliged to ask how it comes about that an Englishman named Webber, a ship-captain and partly a ship-owner, should have a Biscayan colleague. The natural explanation would be that the joint-ownership and joint-venture was the outcome of previous joint voyages. If Abraham Palaer was a Biscayan whale-fisher, who had been to Greenland with Thomas Webber, they might very well have combined to buy their ship whether we identify it with the original "Mayflower" or not. They went whaling together in a "Mayflower" and they accumulated enough money by the enterprise to buy the ship that they sailed in. And since Mr. Thomas Horth owned such a whaling ship, "Mayflower," in the time

just before we stumble upon Thomas Webber, and since he employed Biscayan seamen, we conclude that it was Mr. Horth's ship that they purchased and took into the Atlantic trade. By this time at any rate she must have shown signs of age.

Now let us see if we can follow the fortunes of the good ship and its owners in the other direction.

We may, I think, take it for granted that the Palaer-Webber partnership did not long continue; there is no further trace of Mr. Palaer, and Mr. Webber appears in the Boston documents of 1652 as the sole owner, selling the ship, bit by bit, to New England purchasers, while the ship herself continues in the trade between Boston and London by way of the West Indies.

In January, 1655, the "Mayflower" has disappeared, and Thomas Webber has purchased another ship, the "Recovery," in her place. He is in the Thames, with this ship, waiting with another vessel going the same way, for a Government convoy to Barbadoes.[1]

In April of the same year he makes contract, apparently from Boston, to carry provisions and arms to the Governor of Hispaniola; very soon after this he, too, disappears; and in November of the next year we find his widow, Sarah Webber, appealing to the Navy Commissioners to pay a bill of exchange for £100, granted to her husband for the hire of the "Recovery," by General William Penn and General Gregory Butler, the Parliamentary Commissioners in America; an appeal to which a favourable reply appears to have been returned.[2]

[1] S.P. Dom., Inter. (25 Jan., 1655), vol. ciii., No. 112.

[2] *Ibid.* (6 June, 1656), vol. cxxviii., No. 8, and (12 Nov., 1656), vol. cxlvii., 117, 118; *cf.* vol. cxlviii., 97, 98.

It is very doubtful if there is anything more to be said as to the fate of the "Mayflower". We traced her to Boston and to the year 1654; one is tempted to conjecture that she died (in a nautical sense) not long after. Most likely she was broken up in Boston, or perhaps in the Thames on her last voyage to London. Neither in the one case nor the other would there have been any zeal for the apotheosis of her fragments.

If our method of inquiry is sound, and our facts trustworthy, we may conclude that the ship of Christofer Jones is the original Pilgrim ship of 1620 and is also the Puritan ship of 1629 and 1630, under Captain William Pearce, of Great Yarmouth, and is also Mr. Horth's ship, of Great Yarmouth and the Greenland whale-fishery, and is also the ship, whose owner and master, in her last days, was Mr. Thomas Webber, of Boston.

CHAPTER VII.

MR. VASSALL'S "MAYFLOWER".

WE now turn from one merchant prince of the seventeenth century to another contemporaneous with him, from Mr. Thomas Horth of Yarmouth to Mr. Samuel Vassall of London, a Puritan like the former, and a financial supporter also of the greatest Parliament that England has ever seen, and an actual member of the same. Samuel Vassall was in the fight over ship-money with Hampden and the rest, and was subject to such penal fines and exactions in consequence that he was brought to the verge of bankruptcy, and had to appeal in later days to the Parliament for relief, which was more readily promised than attained.

He was interested from the first in the colonisa-

tion of North America, as almost all good Puritans were. He had a ship named the "Christopher and Mary," which he rechristened in 1634 by the name of "Mayflower"; and he engaged with the Captain of the same, one Peter Andrews, to carry a group of emigrants, under the leadership of Edward Kingswell, to Carolina. Vassall was to convey them across, and to furnish them with a shallop and a pinnace for local fishing and trading after they reached their destination. As it fell out the "Mayflower" was deemed to have too big a draught of water for Carolina, so Vassall proposed to withdraw from the contract. Peter Andrews, however, offered to see them through, and instead of taking them to Carolina, landed them in the James River, among the Virginian Colonists, who were not in a state to give them welcome, or to supply them with shipping to go further south. They arrived in Virginia in October, 1633, and there remained in great distress till the following May. Kingswell, indignant at the treatment of himself and friends, came back to England and lodged an appeal against Vassall and Andrews for breach of contract. This came before the Privy Council in September, 1634.[1] The case came up for hearing and both Vassall and Andrews were committed to prison, from whence they issued protests and appeals; Mr. Vassall arguing that Kingswell had been informed that there was not enough water on the coast for the "Mayflower," that another ship had been offered for the voyage, but he had refused it, and was taken to winter in Virginia at his own request.[2]

Apparently it was the same ship that took passengers

[1] S.P. Colonial, under date, vol. viii.
[2] *Ibid.* for Jan., 1636, vol. viii.

to Virginia in 1641, for we find that Lawrence Green, merchant, applies to the Privy Council for a warrant to transport twenty passengers in the "Mayflower" with provisions to Virginia, and the licence was granted on 20 October, 1641.[1] Next year Mr. Vassall placed his ship at the disposal of the Parliament, and she was employed for eight months in the summer and then again for the winter as one of the ships in guard of the home waters.[2] She is described as the "Mayflower" of London. It appears that she was again appointed for summer service for six months from 25 March, 1643.[3]

In 1644 the Navy Committee again engaged the ship for summer and winter service. She seems to have been in constant demand.[4]

As the ship "Mayflower" stands in 1645 at the head of the list of merchant ships taken into the Navy, we conclude that this is the same ship that was impressed or engaged in the previous year. It is stated that her tonnage is 400 tons, so that we can see clearly that she is not the "Mayflower" that we have been in search of. Moreover, as stated above, she was originally known (before 1633) as the "Christopher and Mary". So we call her Mr. Vassall's "Mayflower" and note that she was frequently in the service of the Government. When Vassall appealed to the Protector in 1654, he not only related the losses which he had incurred in resisting ship-money, for which Parliament had voted him the sum of £10,445, of which he had received not a penny, but he enclosed the Parliament orders in the case, as well as the unpaid bills for the hire of the "Mayflower"

[1] S.P. Colonial, vol. x., No. 85.

[2] S.P. Dom., vol. ccccxciv., No. 13.

[3] *Ibid.* (4 March, 1643), vol. ccccxciv.

[4] *Ibid.* (20 Nov., 1644), vol. div., No. 121.

and two other ships.[1] It made a portentous total. One paid for one's opinions in those days, with friend as well as foe.[2]

Note on Mr. Webber's Purchase of the "Recovery".

It is interesting to note that the "Recovery," which Mr. Thomas Webber bought to replace the "Mayflower," was probably a direct acquisition from the Royal Navy. There had been attempts to sell the ship into the merchant service as far back as 1649. The following entries from the Leybourne-Popham correspondence will explain the matter :—

(Purchase of the "Recovery". Leybourne-Popham MSS. P. 46.)
1649. Oct. 18. Robert Coylmore to Col. Edward Popham, Whitehall.

I shall endeavour to hasten forth the "Recovery," but I am informed that some of the Commissioners have a design to cast her, and so by that means have her for themselves or some of their friends. I have often acquainted you that the State cannot have faithful service done by them so long as many of them are owners of ships, and practise the trade of merchandising, and some others of them are woodmongers and buyers and sellers of timber. If you will have the navy and the Commonwealth faithfully served you must have the Commissioners free from such practices. . . .

P. 46. The same to (the same).

1649. Oct. 19.

Whitehall. Your brother (Col. Alexander Popham) came to town with his lady to-day. "You may be pleased to write a line or two to the Council of State for the setting forth of the 'Recovery,' for I understand that some persons have a design to buy her for merchant affairs. The Captain and all the Officers will certify that she is a new strong ship, and will sail better than any of the prize ships."

It appears from this that she was a recently acquired prize.

[1] S.P. Dom. (6 April, 1654), vol. lxix., No. 25.

[2] The petition was renewed on 26 June, 1655, and later.

1651. P. 94. Colonel Popham's Diary: (in North Sea).

. . . (July) 10th . . . the wind was W. in the morning, several ships came in from the Southward, some bound for Newcastle, some for Scotland to which the "Recovery" and the "Paradox" were convoys. . . .

The "Recovery" was still engaged in convoy work in the North Sea in Aug. 1654, when Capt. John Blythe writes from Harwich to say that he has shipped provisions at Ipswich, and will hasten to Newcastle and observe the orders of the Admiralty Commissioners (S.P. Dom., vol. 87, 66).

In the following year she was sold out of the service: see also Oppenheim, *Administration of the Royal Navy*, p. 332: but he appears to be incorrect in saying that she was acquired as a prize in 1652).

APPENDIX I.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM JOHN ELIOT.

THROUGH the kindness of Dr. Arnold Thomas, of Bristol, I have received a copy of another letter, belonging to the same series as those described above, and evidently derived from the very same source. The following is the text of the letter:—

COPY OF A LETTER FROM JOHN ELIOT TO JONATHAN HANMER.

"Reverend and much-respected in the Lord Jesus.

"I received your loving letters by Mr. Addington, who took ship at Bristol for New England, who told me the same which your letters did import, viz., several parcels of linen cloth committed to his hand from your people to me for the Indian work, but, saith he, they came too late, viz., a very little space before the ship set sail, insomuch that there was no liberty nor room for them in the ship, and therefore he left them with Mr. Deane, a friend of yours in Bristol, with order that they should be sent up to London to one Mr. Clarke, a friend of yours there, and shipped for New England. And said, moreover, it was like they would come by the next ship; but it is like that could not be attained for I know of neither letters nor any goods come by any of the vessels.

"But more ships are expected at this end of the year (if the Lord will) by which they may possibly issue, but

God's time is best. I believe there is a blessing in it which way soever it falleth ; the delay shall be blessed, disappointment shall be blessed, if in such turning the goods should be lost, that also shall be blessed, and your love and bounty and care and the bounty of the donor accepted of God, and blessed, none the less for such a disappointment, for God is the Lord in all His dealings and Wisdom, love, mercy, and goodness are writ on the frontispiece of every providence to an age of Wisdom that can find it out and read it.

"The Lord's work, through His grace, goeth on among the Indians, and whereas last year we had but one town on foot, viz., that of Natek, now we have three more, and the further not more than fully 30 miles distant from us, and sundry do come in and submit themselves unto the Lord, and before many of His people—some of them—and this year I have not again attempted the work because I desired first to know the acceptance the Lord gave to their confessions, but now we are purposed, if the Lord will, the next Spring to attempt the work again. We are not without very great discouragements, but the Lord maketh it appear that it is His work and upholdeth it through all difficulties. Sir, we do greatly need your prayers unto the Lord for His support, guidance and blessing.

"I perceive it is difficult for such as live in the country to get anything transported to New England, and therefore I have taken this course that Mr. Bulcher at London and Mr. Pym at Exeter, will take that care for any that mind to send to us. But I desire, privately to avoid offence for the public collectors in England, and the commissioners here are not well-pleased with such things, though I think it is their infirmity, for the Lord hath appointed private as well as public charity, and

hath blessed in this Indian work private charity to accomplish the most of it that is done, but the more privacy is used the less occasion is given to such as may through infirmity stumble. But I shall cease any further to trouble you but in much haste committing you to the Lord and all your holy labours to His blessing.

"Your loving fellow-labourer in the Lord's Vineyard,

"John Eliot."

"Roxbury, this 28th day of October 1653.

"Mr. Addington was buried this week."

The foregoing document is interesting in several respects. It confirms our view that the goods shipped to John Eliot for his Indians did not come direct from Bristol. They were, in fact, too late for the ship, and had to be forwarded to London. The letter is marked by a very Christian spirit of resignation, and there is a pathetic touch about the complaint of the commissioners against John Eliot, and their want of confidence in him. It seems that John Eliot had been collecting Indian missionary subscriptions privately, whereas the Parliament wished it to be a national matter, and had directed collections to be made all over the country, just as they did in the case of the levy for the sufferers from the Piedmont massacres. I have in my possession the return of the collectors for the town of Halifax, a very interesting document, with entries going down to the traditional widow's mite, and showing how widespread, from the first, was the Puritan feeling towards the missionary aspect of colonisation. The following is the document referred to :—

A particuler followeing who gave, — day of November, 1653, for and towards ye promoteing of ye Gospell amongst ye natives of New England, and ye said moneys is to be

bestowed on lands in our land to ye value of 2000 lbs a yeare and so be sent over to them yearly to bring native children to read.

	lb.	s.	d.
Dr. Jonath. Maud		10	0
Robt. Booth, minister.		10	0
Ely Bentley, min.		10	0
Mrs. Antho. Foxcroft		10	0
Tho. Lister. Shipden	1	0	0
Tho. Bins. Halifax	1	0	0
Robt. Hall. Boothtown		10	0
Joseph Fournèss		10	0
Davy Whitaker		10	0
Robt. Ramsden		6	3
Rich. Blacketh		8	0
Dan. Greenwood		5	0
Thom. Hinde		5	0
John Milnes		5	0
Will. Aspinall		5	0
Robt. Cawdry		2	6
James Hodgson		2	6
Mich. Hopwood			4
Joseph Longbotham		1	0
John Whitley			4
Hen. Croft			6
Michell Holdsworth			6
Antho : Westerman		2	6
James Scarbrough		2	6
Jos. Bawnforth			4
Franc. Buraclough		1	0
Widow grace Holland		5	0
Danyell Gibson		1	0
uxor George Denton			6
Abra. Wood		5	0
Ellin Drake		2	6
Robt. Naylor			6
John Thompson		1	0
Lidia Rawson		2	0
Jer. Worrall			6
Jacob Turner		1	0
Sara Thomas		1	0
Mrs. Doro. Waterhouse	1	0	0
Tho. Cockroft			9
Eliz. Robt.		1	6
John Worrall		2	0
Jo : Brearcliffe		5	0
Tho. Burch			4
Sam. Dobson			2
Mary Greathead		1	0
Tho. Sadd		5	0
John Boyes		5	0
Ri. Lightowler			6
Eliz. Newton		1	6
Edward Jackson wife			4
Martha Grimsha		1	0
Hen. Priestley		2	0
Samuell Warde			6
John Crowther			4

	lb.	s.	d.
Rich. Highley			2
John Crigg			6
Robt. Watson			4
Miles Lake		1	0
Jo. Smith on green		1	0
Hen. Brigge			2
Robt. Baraclough		2	6
James Smith			3
John Brigge			4
Judith Newton			6
Mich. Bentley		3	0
Thom. Rigge		5	0
uxor wray			6
Thom. Sutcliff			2
Tho. Horsfall			4
Jer. Wolton			4
Ruth Tetlow			6
Hen. Gledhill			4
Mr. John Vavisor		2	6
uxor Gra. Horsfall			6
Hen. Green			6
Dan. Tetlow		2	0
Grace Wibwine			6
Jas. Stogdall		1	0
Ann Gibson		2	0
Will Horton		1	0
Dan Greenwood junr.		5	0
Sam Hartley		1	0
Jane Oates			6
Sam. Burnclough			3
widow Butterfeild			10
uxor Mary Sutcliffe			4
Jo. Robinson			6
Jo. Richardson		2	6
Edmo. Lord		1	0
his wife			6
Martha Hudson			6
Tho. Walker			6
Isack Lum			6
Rich. Cooke			6
John Hollyday		1	0
James Shak(leton)			6
Ambros Noble			4
Georg. Croft			4
John Hobson			4
Elia Hartley			6
Rowla : Helm			6
James Harison			6
Thom. Hartley			6
Mrs. Lue Baraclough		5	0
Sam Michell		5	0
Susan ffrear			6
James Cowlters			4
widow Deane		1	0
Sam. Bentley		2	0
Eden Colden			6
criple			6
Robt. Broadley		2	
wid. Stocks		1	0
Abra. Shakleton			10
Mr. H. C. Turner		3	0
John Nicoll			6
Tho. Brooke			6
Tim. Kerby		1	6
Tho. Karnell		1	0
uxor ma. Lake		1	6
John Robts.		1	0

	lb.	s.	d.		lb.	s.	d.
John Jarrett			4	Jane Tenant			2
Ralph Crosby			3	Robt. Gladhill			4
Jarett Goodburne			4	Doct. Power			—
Edwa. Jackson		2	0	Godfrey Newton		1	0
John Glover		1	0	Will Scolfeild		1	6
Robt. Henson		5	0	Robt. Hardy			4
Robt. Deane		3	6	Wilm. Flecher			3
John Taylor		2	6	Susan Lunn			6
Izack bates			4	Jane Allenson		1	0
John Bentley			4	John Michell			6
widow Nicoll			3	John Enley			6
Robt: Nicoll			6	John Lucey			3
Rich. Husband			6	John Learoyd			6
Arthur milnes			6	Jo. Smith Hall			
wid Clough		2	0	End			6
Hugh Glover		1	0	Mr. Bentley for a			
Wilm. Sturdey		2	0	ffreind		2	6
Bernard Glover			4				

I am indebted to Mr. Hanson, of Halifax, for my copy of this interesting document.

APPENDIX II.

FURTHER HANMER LETTERS.

We have explained above that the letters of John Eliot and the Bill of Lading of the "Mayflower" came into the possession of Mrs. Luke from the family records of the Hanmers. In the same connexion there were several more Hanmer letters; and as they are of interest not only to Barnstaple people, where Jonathan Hanmer for so many years lived and worked, but also to all who are students of the rise of English Nonconformity, we subjoin them in an appendix. The first is a congratulatory epistle from Jonathan Hanmer to a son at Cambridge who has had the good fortune to be elected to a scholarship. It is a beautiful example of paternal care and solicitude, couched for the most part in Biblical language but instinct with real feeling and wise forethought. The counsels to sanctity were judiciously combined with advice to date one's letters, and to acknowledge the receipt of money! Here is the epistle :—

A Letter from Jonathan Hanmer to His Son (John)[1] at Cambridge in 1659 (1658).

Dear Son,

I received your last letter (as I suppose) with your tutor's inclosed; wherein you gave me notice of

[1] John Hanmer was admitted Pensioner of St. John's College on 30 June, 1659. The other two brothers are George and Meredith (the latter being named after Meredith Hanmer, the translator of Eusebius, who died in 1604).

your standing for and obtaining of a schollership ; which I was glad to hear of, and for which (as a mercy) I desire to blesse the Lord. I perceive the master, Mr. Broadgate and your tutor were your speciall friends heerin, for which kindness I am much obliged to them, and have returned my thanks in the inclosed to them. Be you thankful to them also and study to deserve their love ; but above all blesse the Lord and exalt him as the donour of this and all your other mercies, and improve them to his glory as talents given you to that end. My son, take due notice of and be affected with the goodness of God hitherto, in guiding you hither, in giving you such favour from those with you and blessing your endeavours thus far. Now what doth thy Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear and love him with all thy hart and soule, and chearfully to serve him with a perfect hart and willing minde, and to walke in uprightness before him, doing all the will of God and that with delight. The good Lord give thee a hart so to do, and to finde his goodness and mercyes (speciall and spirituall) melting thy hart, imbittering sin to thee, putting thee upon the dayly mortification of it in the strength of Xt out of an utter detestation thereof, and bringing thee neerer and neerer home to God in Xt and binding thee fast to him, so engaging thy hart to the wayes and service of the Lord (as best and sweetest) that thou maist resolve through grace never, oh never to depart therfrom. Keep close to God, labour to know more and more experientially what 'tis to walk with and draw near to God, so as to finde the Lord graciously drawing nigh to thy soule, and aboundantly beutifying it with his grace : keep your hart in a spirituall, serious frame, exercised about such things as may do thee good ; take heed of and give not way to sleightness (specially

in holy dutyes) and vanity of spirit: let the word of Xt dwell richly in thee, be sweet to thee, and accounted by thee more than thy dayly food: look to and by faith live on the Lord Jesus as thy treasure, and walke worthy of him. Be much in duty, neglect no means or oportunity for thy spirituall advantage: make those that are Xts thy bosome friends, and frequent and improve their society. Be holy and humble; eminent this way. Apply your study diligently and still looke to heaven for a blessing: be getting somewhat everyday, and in time you will find what you have to be considerable: and still remember that the end of study is to make you serviceable to God and his Church. Consider hereof and the Lord give thee a good understanding in all things.

Your last letter was without date: in your letters you should still give notice how it is with you as to health; and signify to us whether you receive all the things sent you, viz., those in your boxe, wherein beside your cloth for a coat were some other things and tokens from your mother, sister, cozen etc., which you mention not; tis a neglect, amend it, and let your friends have your thanks. I sent you a piece of gold of 5l by Mr. Naylor, give me notice whether you received it or no. Also let me know what's the yearly value of your schollership, and what your exhibition is worth: and be a good husband. Enquire whether sir Burgesse be not sir Antony Burgesses son of Sutton Colfield; if so, remember me to him, and desire him to give my respects to his father when he writes to him; for he was my ancient acquaintance in Emmanuell College. When you deliver the enclosed, present my respects and service to the m[aste]r, my respects to Mr. Broadgate and love to Sir Lecke (?) In your letters I would have you

remember your respects and love to your friends, naming some speciall ones in particular. Remember to write monthly. To the grace of our loving God and father in Xt I commend thee, and so rest

Thy tenderly loving father
who will still rejoyce to hear of thy
welfare

J. HANMER.

BARSTAPLE, 5*th Jan.* 1659.

The next letter is addressed to Mr. John Hanmer, who was at that time residing with Lady Hookes at Tangier Park, near Basingstoke. It is unsigned, so that one cannot say if it comes from one of his brothers or not. It is chiefly concerned with the political outlook. The time was a very difficult one for Nonconformists who were beset on one side by appeals for Toleration from the Roman Catholics, and by schemes for comprehension by the Anglicans, and were not disposed to believe in the sincerity of either movement. The writer of the letter is evidently watching the situation very carefully. Likewise he watches and describes the great comet which had appeared, and describes it as if it were invisible at Basingstoke! Altogether a very interesting letter.

A LETTER TO MR. JOHN HANMER AT BASINGSTOKE:
25 December 1680.

These for Mr. John Hanmer at Tangier Park nere Basingstoke. To be left at the Office for conveyance as above.

My last ended with the voting of the addresse but this tells you that the k(ing) received it and made no

answer, but the Houses sitt, and in all likelihood will til they have perfected their work. The warrant for executing Stafford on Wednesday was signed by the king, the chancelor, and speaker of the House of Commons. The Spanish hath seconded the Dutch memoriall and leaves the obstructive of forreign alliances without excuse, and a kind of necessity that the Parlim^{t} be not parted with. The Commons have settled Mr. Lee in the place of Ackland for Barnstaple, and have ordered the Mayor and Town Clerk to be fetcht up by the serjeant at Arms. And in likelihood with addition of complaints will humble him to purpose. Both bills for union of Protestants have been read twice and committed. A bill is ordered to be brought in for repealing the Act of Corporation. They have ordered the Committee who were to draw up the Inpeachment agst L^{d} Ch. Ju. North to draw up impeachmts agst Ld. Ch. Ju. Scrogs, and Weston and Jones. Dolbeen hardly escaped but many Freinds in the House spared him. They have likewise ordered an Impeachmnt against Thomson of Bristoll, to let the Bps see what clergy they imploy. The Commons gave thanks to Dr. Burnett which was pious, but denied to Dr. Sprat who was reflective in hys sermon. They have adjourned themselves til Thursday next. On Wednesday Dr. Fell, Bp. of Oxon, preacht befor the L^{ds} and told them that (we) were come to the bottom of the Popish plott, but there was another that none could fathom agst the church. His speech is laied up in Lavender. I commend to your reading the addresses, Dutch memoriall, and History of Succession as worth your time. On Thursday in the Lords' House, Shaftesbury made a speech for two houres and ript up the Govenmt of England from [16]62 to [16]80 and showed what ministers of state we had and how our

interest stood abroad with such smartnes that it is said the k(ing) smote his breast with his hand and said, if things were so he must and wd take new measures. The House fell on ag . . . ill ministers Halifax, Feversham alias Duras, and Clarendon, and of the Clergy . . . London and Bath and Wells. And have ordered any peer to renew it on Monday 7^{n} night. They sent down Mr. Seymours answer to his Articles of Impeachmn^{t} to the Commons, and have restored Brown clerk of Cooper's Hall to all his places, and have ordered the order for it to be printed, so have the Commons their Committees and report about Thomson. Stafford had no mind to die a martyr, but his wife and daughter hinder him from confessing and have brought in one Gadbury[1] to assure him he would not outlive the next year if he should escape. He hath written to the Sheriffs for a large scaffold to have it hung with black to be kept from the people. To have liberty of speech without interruption etc. All which he will not want. The warrant for his execution signed by the King was on . . . petition, signed by the Chancelor, and Speaker of the Commons by order of both Houses. As to the Comett, I have seen the blaze for above a week and more and have measured it and found it to be in length above the Horizon three parts to the quadrant. Last night I saw both the starre and blaze which is much lessened in its length. I never have read of so long a stream and the best account I can give you of the things of that nature is to refeare you to the Philosophicall Transactions about the last Comet where you will have an account of that in Cassiopoea.

As to Stillingfleets book the compiler for the presse

[1] An astrologer?

confessed the manuscript was written with two sorts of hands, both well known to him. The serious part with Dr. Stillingf. own hand, the reflective part with the hand of another Dean known to you. Ther is little of witt in the repartees but much acrimony. He takes out peeces of his Author and . . . them. His Historical part is out of ill authors. He hath don the Church cause no advantage, the thing most learned of is four or five forreign eples in the end. Some from Lemoyne informed by Durek (?) and writing with the same black Inck he did. Longing for the same preferm^{t}. The others are extended answers from Monsieurs Claude and Ange (?) upon letters written to them and answred according to the representation sent them, but Monsieur Claude hath exprest in Conference other sentimts of the Nonconformists. I suppose there will be care taken to give the world an account of the letters in time. The [bookseller] hath done the Dean a kindnes so as his weaknes will fall into the fuer hands being six shillings price. It is Satturday and I cannot adde but an account of God's mercy in the delivery of my wife of a daughter on Thursday morning a month before expected, but God better numbers our times for us. Mother and child in hopefull state, for the which I pray help on our praise . . . the perfecting mercy for us. The Lord have you alwaies in his protection.

I am,

Dr. Sr.

Yrs. Decem. 25. 80.

On the back there are shorthand notes of a sermon (?).

We come next to a joint letter to Mr. John Hanmer, from his two brothers Meredith and George, written from Barnstaple, 3 October, 1682. The letter has a good

deal to say of Barnstaple life and politics. Some local magnate who is described by initial (S.) has been behaving in an overbearing manner, and having too much his own way (some local attorney, perhaps, or person of artificially accentuated influence). Things are so bad in Barnstaple that the brothers are thinking of migrating to New England or Carolina! The report of old Mr. Hanmer's health is depressing: calculus racks him. It would be better for him to be moved to Bideford, or Barnstaple, where he could have care.

LETTERS OF MR. GEORGE HANMER AND MR. MEREDITH HANMER TO THEIR BROTHER MR. JOHN HANMER, 3 October, 1682.

For Mr. John Hanmer att my Lady Hookes att Tangeare Park neare Bazinstook.

BARNSTAPLE,
3th 8ber. 1682.

DEARE BRO,

I must acknowlidg myselfe faultie in neglecting to write you of late; but really I have att preasant little to say more then to advise you that through mercy our families are in good health. As for y^e^ affares of the towne, they are (almost) altogeather maniged by imperious S., who rules heare arbytrarilie, butt of late hee hath reather lost then gaind ground; for this reason Counsellor Dynnis that was our Recirder will serue the towne no longer, soe that another Recorder must be chosen: now one Counsellor Hoper offers himselfe, butt S. will and doth indevor what hee can for the place for which cause seuerall of the magistrates and many other considerable persons of the Towne that were formerlie great admyrers of S., seeing how his excessiv ambition and pride doe stiflie opose and much disrespect him, butt I

feare notwithstanding hee will car[ry] itt right or wrong. Really things heare and att other places seeme to be running into confution. Sum dredfull storme seemes to be impending, and just ready to fall on us, soe that I would allmost wish that wee were well settled, either in New England or Carolina; butt the Lord knows what is best for us and hee over rules all, and men shall doe noe more than hee permitts, and all shall work togethr for the good of God's people. By reason of the presant proceedings tradesmen are mightelie discouridged, soe that trading is very dull and flatt. I feare that my concernes this yeare will reather bee to my disadvantidg than profitt, butt I desire to bee contented. Heare has byn of late in these partes a very malignant fevor which hath swept away many people. In this Towne Mr. Ol. Peard hath buried his wife, which is a sore affliction to the pore man, spetially in this juncture now hee can't with saftie continew with his familie. The ould Mr. Harris, Mrs. Greal, Ric^{d} Swine, and many others are also ded since I came hyther. Wee herd on Friday last from father who is now indifferent well, but had latelie a fitt of the stone, hee is remeued from Coz. Nottells and is now a border att M. Whitfields—wee have earnestlie desired him (by letter) to com before winter either for Combe, this place, or Biddeford, for wee feare hee'l want careful attendance. You do seeme to intimate in your letter to sister, that you have sum thoughts to come hither eare long, which I hartelie wish you would doe, that wee might a little refresh and comfort ine another these unpleasant dejecting tymes.

I shall onlie add that wee all dearlie remember you.

I am

Your affectionate Bro.

GEO. HANMER, 1682.

(As a postscript to the foregoing the following was added by M(eredith) H(amner).)

Dear bro, your letter I receiv'd a lord's day and did exceedingly rejoyce to hear from you, an should haue writen you more at large now, but that bro. George has done it for me. I have only this to add, to desire you to write to father, seconding my letter which I sent him by the post a Lord's day, to com into these parts, either hear or at Bidyford, which he might safely do if he wold confine himself hear as he doeth where he is, I am greatly concerning for him fearing he may want that atendence his age requires. The newes I have to write you is that yesterday Ms Margaret Atkey was marryed to Mr. Hobbs and this day Mr. Parminter and the widdow and several of the neighbours were hear at diner, who came to give brother George his welcome to his new habitation where you were hartily remembred.

We are all going this evening to give Mr. Hobs and his wife the joye. I have nothing to ad seing the paper is don but hartily wish the widdow were the best tempred woman in this country for you. This with my dear loue.

M. H.

The back of the letter covered with shorthand writing, apparently a sermon.

The last letter, dated 27 June, 1691, is addressed to John Hanmer by the elders of the struggling Nonconformist Church of Tiverton. They have found a pastor in Mr. Moore and arranged for his induction. Flavell is coming from Dartmouth to preach and a Mr. Wood. An appeal is made for similar help from Mr. Hanmer. The explanation is that John Hanmer has followed his father's footsteps and is now a Nonconformist minister at Barnstaple. He is co-pastor with

Mr. Oliver Peard mentioned in the previous letter, who himself had been colleague to Jonathan Hanmer. John Hanmer appears to have been ordained in 1682 and to have been, like his father, an excellent preacher.

In Calamy's *Continuation of the Nonconformist Memorial* (i., p. 34) is an account of Jonathan Hanmer, which betrays the knowledge of a correspondence between him and John Eliot, which was extant, as well as a number of letters between Jonathan Hanmer and his son at Cambridge.

"Among his papers there are many letters under the hand of Mr. *John Elliot* of *New England*, in which he returns him hearty thanks for his readiness to help forward the cause of the gospel by the generous supplies which he prepared and sent over."

This describes very well the letters which we have printed from John Eliot. Calamy goes on to give some extracts of letters of Jonathan Hanmer to his son (John) at Cambridge. None of the extracts is from the letter which we have printed.

The Mr. Nichol, of Exeter, to whom Eliot refers, is Ferdinando Nicoll (Nicholls), B.D., vicar of St. Mary Arches, ejected for nonconformity in 1662.

THESE FOR THE REU^{n} MR. JOHN HANMER MINISTER OF THE GOSPLE IN BARNSTABLE.

REUND SIR,

It is no small comfort to us that after all the troubles this poor Church hath mett withall, that the worthy and our beloved Mr. Moore hath not only stood by us; but by the goodness and mercy of God to us, hath complyed with our call to be our pastor: the day for setting him ap[ar]te to office will be on Wensday next,

and it was agreed upon at Exeter this week. Mr. Flavell and Mr. Wood haueing purposed to preach wee do now intreat you to come on tuesday.

In hast
we Remayne with all due
Respects Sir your Brethren and
seruants in the Lord.

TIVERTON the 27th June, 1691.

PETER BERE
R. PROWSE
NICHOLAS HITCHCOOKE
ALEXANDER JOHNS
MATTHEW WOOD.

ADDITIONAL NOTE FOR PAGE 81.

The dispute which is here alluded to was not over a voyage to Bordeaux and Rochelle: the Aldborough ship was chartered for Portugal; we can, however, find a better proof of the direct connection of Mr. Horth and the "Mayflower," which he had acquired, with Biscay and the Biscayans. When the Muscovia Company presented a petition to the Council of State against Mr. Horth on 13 May, 1631, they ask that the Council will stay a ship and a pinnace about to be set forth from Yarmouth by Nathaniel Wright and Thomas Hoarth, under the patent granted in Scotland to Nathaniel Edwards. Their pretence, so the petitioners say, is to fish the whale in Iceland: *they have, in fact, hired Baskoes to go to Greenland.*[1]

Here we see the direct connection between Horth and the Bay of Biscay, and between the whale fishery and the Bay trade.

[1] S.P. Dom. (under date), vol. cxci.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Images Processed by Gary Brin
Copyright © Nancy Hanks Lincoln Public Library

NANCY HANKS LINCOLN PUBLIC LIBRARY
Historical Book Collection

Nancy Hanks Lincoln Public Library